

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 422 197

SO 028 559

AUTHOR Butts, R. Freeman
TITLE Education for Civitas: The Lessons Americans Must Learn.
Working Paper Series in Education.
INSTITUTION Stanford Univ., CA. Hoover Institution on War, Revolution,
and Peace.
REPORT NO ED-97-1
PUB DATE 1997-05-00
NOTE 61p.
AVAILABLE FROM Stanford University, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution,
and Peace, Stanford, CA, 94305-6010.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Change; *Citizenship Education; *Civics; Civil Rights;
Constitutional Law; Democracy; Freedom; Justice; Political
Science; *Standards
IDENTIFIERS *CIVITAS

ABSTRACT

This essay explores the various definitions of "civitas" and how those definitions have valuable lessons for people. "Civitas" means both a political community or government, especially as found in a republic, and the kind of citizenship a republic requires. Specifically the paper examines the role of government in education and the role of education in preparing youth for citizenship in a constitutional democratic republic. The essay provides historical examples of the changing roles of citizenship from Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Robert M. LaFollette, Jr. to Hillary Rodham Clinton. The paper also examines parental rights, vouchers, charter schools, privatization of public schools, and the move toward national standards and tests. The essay is divided into two parts: (1) "Education for Civitas: The Lessons Americans Must Learn"; and (2) "Afterword: The Politics of Educational Reform." (EH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 422 197

Working Paper Series in Education

**EDUCATION FOR CIVITAS:
The Lessons Americans Must Learn**

by

R. Freeman Butts

**Working Papers in Education
ED-97-1**

**THE HOOVER INSTITUTION
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
MAY 1997**

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFORM,
AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC
COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY,
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gerald A.
Dofman

2A TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

Hanna Collection on the Role of Education

Hoover Institution

Stanford University

SO 028 559

**EDUCATION FOR CIVITAS:
The Lessons Americans Must Learn**

by

R. Freeman Butts

**Working Papers in Education
ED-97-1**

**THE HOOVER INSTITUTION
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
MAY 1997**

Dr. Butts is William F. Russell Professor Emeritus in the Foundations of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. He was a visiting Scholar at the Stanford School of Education (1976-78) and at the Hoover Institution (1980-86). His book, *The Civic Mission of Educational Reform; Perspectives for the Public and the Profession*, was published by the Hoover Institution Press in 1989. He was a Hanna Distinguished Fellow in Education at Hoover in 1993.

Part I of this Working Paper was prepared by Professor R. Freeman Butts in the Spring of 1996. It was the basis for his lecture inaugurating an annual colloquial series on "Critical Issues and Enduring Ideas in Contemporary Education" held in honor of the late Robert Holmes Beck, noted philosopher of education at the College of Education and Human Development, University of Minnesota at Minneapolis. The lecture was delivered by Professor Butts to an all-university audience on May 2, 1996, just as the presidential campaign was making it clear that education would become one of its major political issues.

The text of Part I printed here is the longer draft from which his lecture was drawn. It has not been altered to take account of events that occurred during the summer and fall of the 1996 campaign or in the new Democratic Administration and Republican Congress that began in Washington in January 1997. However, an "Afterword" is appended as Part II of this Working Paper to call attention to pertinent developments that occurred during the year from May 1, 1996 to May 1, 1997, when this Paper was made available by the Hanna Collection on the Role of Education in Society of the Hoover Institution.

The views expressed in this paper are solely those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the staff, officers, or Board of Overseers of the Hoover Institution.

PART I

EDUCATION FOR CIVITAS: The Lessons Americans Must Learn

May 1, 1996

A Few Lessons from History	p. 3
Jefferson's "Text of Civic Instruction" for Public Schools	p. 4
Lincoln's Public Universities and Equality	p. 11
LaFollette's "Wisconsin Idea"	p. 14
"The Politics of Mistrust"	p. 17
"The Politics of Virtue"	p. 20
The Free Market in Educational Reform	p. 26
Parental Rights	p. 27
Vouchers	p. 29
Charter Schools	p. 32
The Privatization of Public Schools	p. 34
The Urgency of National Standards in Education for Civitas	p. 35
The <u>National Standards for Civics and Government</u>	p. 36
<u>CIVITAS</u> and the Icons of Civic Virtue	p. 38
Civitas Coalitions Here and Abroad	p. 43
Education for Civitas a Seamless Web	p. 47

PART II

AFTERWORD: The Politics of Educational Reform

May 1, 1997

One Year Later: Conciliation or Combat?	p. 51
The Free Market Approach to Educational Reform	p. 56
Parental Rights	p. 56
Vouchers and School Choice	p. 57
Charter Schools	p. 60
Privatization of Public Schools	p. 64
The Urgency of National Standards for Civitas Education	p. 68
"The Politics of Standards"	p. 69
"The Time Is Now" - One More Time	p. 78
"What REALLY Matters Most"	p. 84
An International Framework for "Education for Democracy"	p. 92
Civil Society and Service Learning	p. 94
A Civitas "Summa" for the Next Education Summit	p. 96

PART I
EDUCATION FOR CIVITAS
The Lessons Americans Must Learn

I am deeply honored to be asked to give the first keynote address in the colloquial series named for Bob Beck. In fact, I chose "civitas" as the keyword in the title of my remarks, at least in part, because of its classical resonance so dear to Bob. Civitas has common roots with the Latin words for "civis" meaning citizen and "civilitas" meaning the conduct and behavior expected of a good citizen. Civitas is now a perfectly good but seldom used English word, with two related meanings: (1) It means a political community or government, especially as found in a republic, and (2) it means the kind of citizenship a republic requires. I wish to speak of the lessons that Americans must learn about both of these meanings of civitas: the kind of education necessary for perpetuating and strengthening republican government and the kind of education that best promotes democratic citizenship. Throughout, I use the shorthand phrase "education for civitas" to include both meanings.

The lessons could be drawn from history, philosophy, politics, sociology, economics, or international affairs. In fact, these were intertwined in what we at Teachers College used to call the Foundations of Education. But in the time I have today, in this political year, I focus on the political lessons: What is the role of government in education and what is the role of education in preparing youth for citizenship in a constitutional democratic republic?

A Few Lessons from History

Remember that the very idea of a liberal education was originally linked with the practice and preparation for free citizenship - in the *polis* of democratic Athens and in the *civitas* of republican Rome. Each generation was to acquire the civic knowledge and commitments of "civitas." This was also the view of discerning founders of the American Republic and of their successors who decided that the responsibilities and the rights of American citizenship in a democratic republic should be defined by law and nourished by a common civic education and civic culture rather than by kinship, ethnicity, race, religion, class, or hereditary status.

Jefferson's "Text of Civic Instruction" for Public Schools

Let me cite some earlier views of the role of education for American citizenship. Who was the first American to propose a law that vested the very existence of republican government in a state-sponsored system of public education extending from primary schools through a state university? It was, of course, Thomas Jefferson who did so as legislator and governor of Virginia - just three years after he wrote the Declaration of Independence. Who proposed that the curriculum of that public education system from bottom to top should be civic-centered rather than kinship- or religion-centered? Thomas Jefferson.

And who finally engineered the passage in Virginia of Jefferson's Statute for Religious Freedom against the determined opposition of the conservative Christian coalition of his day? It was James Madison - just a year before he went to the Constitutional Convention to strengthen the Federal Government. And who said that "the essential principles of our government" set forth in the Constitution and Bill of Rights should be adopted as "the creed of our political faith, the text of civic instruction?" It was Thomas Jefferson in his first inaugural address as President on March 4, 1800 in the wake of what one American historian has called "the dirtiest presidential campaign in American history," as he sought to heal the wounds of the ferocious partisan bickering of the 1790s, a partisanship that screamed from the pages of an inflamed press and even broke out in physical brawling on the floor of Congress.

Referring calmly and presidentially to "the contest of opinion through which we have passed," Jefferson made it clear that now that the election was over he expected the rules of the Constitution to prevail:

"...all will, of course, arrange themselves under the will of law, and unite in common efforts for the common good. All too will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will to be rightful must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal law must protect, and to violate would be oppression. Let us, then, fellow-citizens, unite with one heart and one mind. Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. And let us reflect that, having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions....But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans. We are all Federalists....[T]his government, the world's best hope...[is] the strongest government on earth."

Then, in one long sentence, Jefferson spelled out his view of "the essential principles of our government." These principles include:

...equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; the support of the state governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies;...the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad;...freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and freedom of person under protection of the habeas corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected. These principles...should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civic instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust...[Emphasis added]

Remember that these are the words of a president who was notable for his strong support, nay almost the very creation, of the idea of public education in a democratic republic. Soon after writing the Declaration of Independence, Jefferson was elected to the Virginia House of Delegates in October 1776, where he served until elected governor in June 1779.

Jefferson was convinced that the Constitution of 1776 of the newly independent state of Virginia had not gone nearly far enough to reform the aristocratic institutions and class distinctions inherited from British rule. So, in 1779 he introduced bills for the abolition of primogeniture and entail of property, for religious freedom from the established Church of England, and for a complete system of public education extending from primary schools through a state university. Jefferson viewed these political, economic, religious, and educational proposals as intertwining means for regenerating at the state level the ideals of liberty, equality, and civic virtue that permeated the Declaration itself.

Through this "revisal of the laws" of Virginia, Jefferson hoped to change Virginia from a hierarchical English colony with its monarchical common law into an American democratic republic. His "Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge" envisioned a system of public education which would become the new crown jewel of democracy, the only "safe depository" for preparing youth for citizenship in a democratic republic.

And, in tune with his efforts to bring religious freedom to Virginia, Jefferson specifically recommended that the morality of citizenship be the fundamental and common ground for public education rather than religious belief or practice. He spelled out these views in his "Notes on the State of Virginia" where he argued that in addition to the three R's the basic content of the primary school curriculum should be suffused with civic history. Listen to his words describing the curriculum "wherein the great mass of the people will receive their instruction"

and the "principal foundations of future order will be laid:"

"Instead, therefore, of putting the Bible and Testament into the hands of children at an age when their judgments are not sufficiently matured for religious inquiries, their memories may be stored with the most useful facts from Grecian, Roman, European, and American history. The first elements of morality too may be instilled into their minds..."

He went on to pen some of the most memorable ideas, today too often forgotten, in the history of American education:

"But of all the views of this law none is more important, none more legitimate, than that of rendering the people the safe, as they are the ultimate, guardians of their own liberty. For this purpose the reading in the first stage...is proposed...to be chiefly historical. History, by apprising them [the students] of the past will enable them to judge of the future; it will avail them of the experience of other times and other nations; it will qualify them as judges of the actions and designs of men; it will enable them to know ambition under every disguise it may assume; and, knowing it, to defeat its views....Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves are its only safe depositories....An amendment of our constitution must here come in aid of the public education."

Yes, it is true that Jefferson was talking about "Euro-American centered" history. He was writing in 1781, before 200 years of historical scholarship were available to him and to his compatriots, but he was trying to take giant steps to broaden the meaning of schooling from its historic role as a religious and family function to a secular and civic function.

These same ends infused his 1779 legislative bill designed to transform the Anglican College of William and Mary into a secular state university. He proposed that the established professor of divinity be replaced by a professor of history, law, and government. And after he joined the College's Board of Visitors as governor in October 1779, the "Professor of Divinity" did indeed give way to a "Professor of Law and Police."

But the time was not yet ripe for Jefferson's education bills to be accepted by the conservative religious and political forces in the Virginia legislature. It was not until 1818 that Jefferson was able to engineer the establishment of the state University of Virginia as a capstone for a public education system devoted to the preparation of an educated citizenry. His "mission statement" of six goals for the university pointedly listed political, economic, scientific, and moral purposes for higher education. There was no explicit religious goal. And the ten professorships (or departments) included the broadest range of fields of knowledge known to any of the American colleges of the day, but no professor of divinity.

Jefferson's third thrust for democracy was his original bill of 1779 proposing a Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom. It did not become law until James Madison roused the state by his vigorous campaign to approve it in 1786, Madison thus defeated the efforts by Patrick Henry and the conservative Christian coalition of the day to gain tax funds for the support of religious teachers of all Protestant denominations. Listen to the words of Henry's assessment bill of 1784. It would have required all persons "to pay a moderate tax or contribution annually for the support of the Christian religion, or of some Christian church, denomination or communion of Christians, or of some form of Christian worship." The rationale was clearly that civic morality must rest upon religious belief. But Madison campaigned the state with his "Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments" so successfully in the summer of 1785 that he was able to convince the legislature to pass Jefferson's bill for religious freedom in January 1786. It states that

"...no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place,

or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinion in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities."

Thus was Madison nurtured by Jefferson and prepared to frame the first two complementary clauses of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution in 1789 whereby "Congress shall pass no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Jefferson and Madison agreed that an assessment or tax for religious worship of any kind was the essence of "an establishment of religion" and that the government should not be intervening in any way except to protect the freedom of religion. No wonder Jefferson wished his own memorial to include this trinity:

Author of the Declaration of Independence
Of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom
And Father of the University of Virginia

Today, many Americans are searching for answers to the weakening of the moral and social fabric that threatens to unravel the political culture of the United States. Some are seeking a "quick fix" by restoring traditional "family values," or prayer in the public schools, or strengthening private and religious schools. But it is sobering to remember that even during the military trauma of the Revolutionary War, Jefferson and other founders of the American states were trying to figure out how to build a viable education for a free and independent community once they finally secured full freedom from Britain.

While the war was raging up and down Virginia, Jefferson was looking ahead and campaigning for establishing public schools free of religious control as basic foundations for building a cohesive civic society while honoring the diverse values of a pluralistic religious people. The glue was to be a public system of universal, free, common schooling whose basic purpose was to prepare all citizens for commitment to the democratic values of the public good, freedom for individual rights, justice, equality, diversity, truth, and patriotism. In fact, many patriots were campaigning for a national system of public schools that would serve the same ends. But that turned out to be even more chimerical than the idea of state systems of public schools.

As president, George Washington could never quite bring himself to be a strong advocate of state systems of public education, but the idea of a National University was a favorite theme of his and he even flirted with the idea of Congressional support for universal public education. In fact, in 1796 as Washington was retiring, the American Philosophical Society of which Jefferson was president, launched an essay contest on "the best system of liberal education adapted to the genius of the government of the United States." Not surprisingly, the two winners were Jeffersonian Democratic Republicans, Samuel Harrison Smith and Samuel Knox. They were not only strongly in favor of public education, but they both went much further to argue that there should be a national system of public educational institutions devoted to the public good, liberty, and equality under federal auspices.

The logic of these young Jeffersonians was impeccable: If state systems of public education were the proper seedbeds for the newly independent states in the 1770s and 1780s, and if those states after a decade of separate independence saw the necessity of a stronger federal union, then there should be a federal system of public education to nourish and support the new national political community of which the Federal government was the Constitutional embodiment. Impeccable logic perhaps, but unpersuasive politics for those times - as well as for our times.

Still, indulge in a little historical whimsy. What if this band of intellectuals along with Jefferson and his Democratic followers for the next fifty years had somehow managed to produce a set of national standards for civics and government based on Jefferson's "text of civic instruction" and had produced successive generations of trained teachers who could teach those ideas and instill those ideals in American children and youth in all the Southern as well as the Northern states for the next fifty years, might we have avoided the Civil War?

After all, it only took Germany and Japan fifty years to replace their totalitarian teachings with democratic learnings after World War II. And, right now, at the end of the cold war, there are significant international efforts going on to strengthen a new civic education and civic culture to speed the shift from communism to democracy in the newly independent countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Coincidentally, one of the most significant of these efforts is called "CIVITAS: An International Civic Education Exchange Program." And, perhaps, even here in the United States a strong program of education for civitas could help us stem the threats to our own civic polity, marked by political passivity on one hand and angry frustration, hateful racism, and nativism on the other. These were familiar ingredients that brewed the original mix of twentieth century fascism and communism in Europe and Asia. But more of this in a moment.

Before I go on, I cannot fail to note that Jefferson's original vision of transforming private religious colleges into secular state universities as a seedbed for developing citizens in a free government was also tried by Jeffersonian Republicans in several other states, but that process was ultimately frustrated by the Supreme Court's Dartmouth College decision of 1819 affirming the Federalist argument that the college's charter was a contract that could not be impaired under the U.S. Constitution. Still, the movement for free, public universities providing the civic leadership necessary for a healthy republic gained momentum. Twenty-one such institutions were established between the Revolution and the beginning of the Civil War in twenty states. However, this was done against the vigorous opposition from religious groups who waged a continuous battle to prevent the public universities from being established by diverting the public funds to religious institutions or to inject religious instruction into the new state universities.

Lincoln's Public Universities and Equality

Now, in order to keep a balanced political view, I remind you that it was a Republican president who signed the Morrill Act in 1862, which in effect made it possible for Jefferson's ideal of a public higher education eventually to be established in every state in the Union. Once upon a time, "big government" seemed not a bad idea to Congressman Justin S. Morrill and to President Abraham Lincoln. It's sobering to note that Morrill was an early "Washington insider." A founder of the Republican Party in Vermont in 1855, he served 12 years in the House of Representatives and 31 years in the Senate, a longer total than any other member of Congress in the nineteenth century. He was most noted as a financial conservative in favor of high protective tariffs but also of generous federal aid to higher education.

As early as 1857, Morrill introduced his land-grant bill into Congress, but it was vetoed by Democratic President James Buchanan on the grounds that it violated states' rights and set up dangerous precedents of federal aid to education. Reintroduced in 1861 after the Civil War had started, the Morrill Act was passed by the Republican Congress in 1862. Again, it was vigorously opposed by private college interest groups and others who feared federal control of education. Eventually, the largesse of the Federal Government to the land grant colleges amounted to some 12 million acres distributed to some seventy institutions of higher education, enormously strengthening Jefferson's original idea of a public university.

Who here today would say that the federal government should have had no role to play in higher education? Yes, a little history may reveal how paradoxical and jumbled our present debates may seem. The Morrill Act was bountiful federal aid by protectionist "Big Government"

Republicans and opposed by religiously conservative states' rights Democrats. We need to keep our eyes on the future and the historic goals of civic community rather than be buffeted by the rhetoric of political partisanship of the moment.

But, I think we should not only recognize and remember the material and economic benefits flowing from the stimulus given to public higher education by Lincoln's administration and the Republican Congress, but, even more, we should be plotting the role that public education at all levels should be playing to achieve the civic goals of American democracy in the future.

If I may draw upon Lincoln's memorable phrases, it is for us the educators and legislators "to be dedicated here to the unfinished work so nobly advanced" by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence and the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, by Madison in the Preamble and the Bill of Rights of the Constitution, and by Lincoln's view of the role of government at Gettysburg. It is for us "to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us" begun by Jefferson's "creed of our political faith" in which he stressed the goal of liberty and the role of education and the people's government in sustaining it, and which Lincoln carried on by underlining the goal of equality as a goal of the people's national government.

We as educators must work more strenuously than ever to achieve equality of educational opportunity for all children and youth in America, especially for the children of poverty and color. We must shoulder "the unfinished work" that Lincoln called upon his generation to do: remove the gap between the ideal of equality and the reality of inequality that still faces American education in the 1990s. This task is especially incumbent upon those of us engaged in teacher education who wish to shape the reform movements for national standards and national assessments so that they will serve both freedom and equality.

In the first sentence of the Gettysburg Address, Lincoln joins liberty and equality as the great civic ideals that link the Declaration of Independence with the Constitution: "...our fathers brought forth...a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." This was Lincoln's reaffirmation of the Declaration's stress on equality that helped to "remake America." As Garry Wills puts it in his scholarly analysis of Lincoln at Gettysburg:

According to Lincoln...the Declaration of Independence was closer to being the founding document of the United States than was the Constitution." (p. 130)
"....For most people now, the Declaration means what Lincoln told us it means, as a way of correcting the Constitution itself without overthrowing it.... The proponents of states' rights may have arguments, but they have lost their force, in courts as well as in the popular mind. By accepting the Gettysburg Address, its concept of a single people dedicated to a proposition, we have been changed. Because of it, we live in a different America." (pp.146-147)

The Republican Revolution of 1994 may mean that Wills was a bit premature by writing in 1993 that proponents of states' rights "have lost their force in courts as well as in the popular mind." Rather, it is abundantly clear that "the unfinished work" and "the great task" still remain before us: a rebirth of freedom of individual rights and a rededication to equality in education. Jefferson and Madison put freedom into the Constitution. Lincoln put equality into the Constitution. The clamorous question this election year is, "What today should be the role of government and of education in achieving and protecting freedom and equality?" I say to you, we cannot achieve the long-term tasks of equality in self-government while maintaining "savage inequality" in educational opportunity, and condition for vast numbers of American children.

Another point about the Gettysburg Address has to do with Lincoln's final sentence, perhaps the three most quoted phrases about democratic government ever coined. They are

usually intoned as follows: "...that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." But notice that all three of these prepositional phrases modify the same noun "government." So, Lincoln's meaning might well be understood if we emphasize the words and interpret them as follows: "that we here highly resolve that...government of the people, government by the people, and government for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Thus, I take it that Lincoln must have been speaking in favor of an activist government that will seek to promote and maintain the political and economic conditions under which the public good, liberty, and equality can survive and flourish. The persisting problem is how to use government to pursue these ends while we also promote the other core values of our democratic society: those civic values devoted to justice, diversity, truth, and patriotism. I shall speak briefly about each of these core values in a moment.

So, despite possible charges of plagiarism and blasphemy of the words of revered authors of "the creed of our political faith," I suggest we need "A Renewed Declaration of Education for Civitas" that goes something like this:

When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for the American people to reform their educational system, these truths are self-evident: that the unalienable purpose of American education is to prepare all youth to become informed and participating citizens committed to the fundamental values and principles of American constitutional democracy; and that to secure the rights and responsibilities of democratic citizenship, the ideal of universal, free, common schooling, leading to a widely available and excellent system of public education, has been instituted in all American states.

Now, we are engaged in a great war of words, testing whether that vision of public education can long endure. We are met at a time when those truths about public education for civitas are being little noted nor long remembered. It is for those of us, the beneficiaries of public education, to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that public education of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this land.

LaFollette's Wisconsin Idea

I cannot, of course, continue in this historical vein throughout this lecture, but I cannot resist recalling another speech that has a personal resonance for me. It happens that I was an undergraduate and graduate student at the University of Wisconsin at a time when there was only one campus - in Madison - and when even the most disastrous football season could be tolerated if we could only beat Minnesota in a final climactic game of the year. So I cannot resist quoting to you the words of the most famous of the governors of Wisconsin on a subject germane to my theme today. And I point out that Governor Robert M. La Follette, Sr., like Jefferson and Lincoln was a career politician in his state as well as in Washington, an activist Progressive somewhere on the political spectrum between Democrats and Republicans. In a rousing speech to the Wisconsin alumni in 1901, "Old Bob" spelled out what the highly touted phrase "The Wisconsin Idea" means for higher education:

[T]he greatness of a state does not lie in its area, its commerce, its... accumulated splendor. It lies back of all these in the character of her citizenship....

I do not know to what extent in this new century the obligation of the student to the state is made part of the daily thought of university life, but I well remember when it found expression in every convocation and was heard from time to time in every classroom....[The student has] an abiding obligation...to pay back in earnest, persistent, conscientious effort for good government, the debt due to the state.

[B]efore all things, the university owes it to the state to give it good citizens....[T]he student should never be permitted to forget while here that he is primarily training for the duties of citizenship....

When this mighty power for the general good is once fully felt throughout the state...the university will not longer come cringing past an impudent and arrogant lobby, as a supplicant to the state....

With the university as a great recruiting station, the ranks of patriotic citizenship shall ever swell with increasing numbers, armed for the state's best service....Not since the days of the sixties have greater issues called for truer men....Strike always for the state and you will strike for the right."

This speech on "The Wisconsin Idea" as of 1901 was reprinted in the Letters and Science Magazine (Spring 1985) as part of the dedication ceremonies for the opening of the Robert M. La Follette Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Wisconsin with the editor's note that "we found La Follette's thoughts to be as fresh today as when he first spoke them."

Now, as we contemplate the end of the century which La Follette opened, some of us may note with some impatience that "Old Bob" addressed the Wisconsin alumni as "men," or we may smile tolerantly or smirk mockingly at his rhetorical flourishes on patriotism; or, we may simply dismiss the idea that liberal education is primarily to prepare citizens for a life of "obligation to the state." But how many governors today are talking this way about their state universities? I can assure you - not in California. How about Wisconsin? Michigan? Minnesota? Are the institutes of public affairs in those institutions as well as those at Harvard, Rutgers, Syracuse, and elsewhere working with the schools of education to improve education for citizenship among prospective and in-service teachers?

And what about college and university students? How are they talking about citizenship? I'm afraid too many of today's college students may think of their high school course in "civics" or "citizenship" (if they took any at all) as the most boring subjects they had to take or sit through, and so they may say in effect, "In college we can skip all that dry stuff about three branches of government, separation of powers, checks and balances, federalism, etc. In college we can study what we want to study - to get a job and all that other good stuff that goes with college life." At a convocation in Madison five years ago, that is exactly what high school students were saying.

Now, 200 years after Jefferson, 130 years after Lincoln, and nearly 100 years after La Follette, we have had more than a decade of political controversy over the educational reform movement launched in 1983 by the Educational Excellence Commission appointed by President Reagan. During this past decade and especially in the midst of the present presidential election year, why have the words and actions of Jefferson, Lincoln, and LaFollette about good government and good citizenship been so little noted nor long remembered?

They have been overshadowed by laments about the lagging economic competitiveness of our work force, weaknesses in science and math, the superiority of decentralized decision-making, and "restructuring of schools." There are recurrent pleas for greater involvement of parents in the school curriculum, and the purported superior values of parental choice in seeking private and religious schooling for their children, paid for by shrinking pools of tax funds. And efforts for school reform have been further complicated by growing fear of drugs, sex, gangs, violence, and crime affecting safety, order, and discipline in the public schools.

So we come to this historic moment of conflict over the role of government and of education

in American life, marked by a conflict between the "politics of mistrust" versus the "politics of virtue." "The Politics of Mistrust"

For some years, opinion polls and scholarly studies have been documenting a pervasive citizen alienation, cynicism, apathy, frustration, anger, and "foul mood" about their government. Soon after the elections of 1994, Daniel Yankelovich, chairman of Public Agenda, put it this way:

The American public is in a foul mood. People are frustrated and angry. They are anxious and off balance. They are pessimistic about the future and cynical about all forms of leadership and government....In 1992, the voters, in their frustration, threw out the Republicans. In last November's election, they threw out the Democrats. The worst feature of the mood is that it is likely to last for a long time....the mood has been building for a long time. And it will not lift until its basic causes have been addressed....

"My fear is that...the present mood will harden into class warfare, generational warfare, exacerbated racial tensions, polarization and political extremism, demagoguery, and instability as we careen from one oversimplistic solution to another." (1)

Yankelovich accounted for the public's foul mood by three trends: the increasingly lopsided character of economic growth in which the majority of Americans are failing to participate; the weakening of shared core values; and a serious disconnect between America's leaders and the citizenry. I wish to call special attention to the core values in a moment.

How does this sound as we approach the election of 1996? Apparently right on the mark. Just two examples: In January 1996, the Washington Post published the results of a poll entitled "The Politics of Mistrust." The poll was conducted by a project team led by Richard Morin, director of polling for the Post, Drew Altman, president of the Kaiser Family Foundation, and Robert J. Blendon of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, aided by a panel of outside experts on political attitudes and public opinion.

The poll documents the growing suspicion and loss of trust in the federal government and many other institutions. This distrust is explained by a number of factors, first of which is the "knowledge gap." People just don't know very much about government or politics, nor do they care. Other causes sound like Yankelovich's: economic insecurity and the decline of trust and increase of cynicism. My concern here is primarily with the assertions that may seem only too obvious to educators: Knowledge is important. "Knowing basic facts about politics does matter." "Without basic facts about the players and the rules of the game, Americans tune out politics and turn off to voting."

Less knowledgeable Americans are not only less likely to vote and participate in public affairs, they are "much more likely to believe that actions by the federal government invariably make every problem worse, a rigid cynicism that the survey found transcends party identification or political ideology." "[M]any Americans are confused by politics because they simply don't know enough basic facts to follow a substantive political debate." "It's just politics" may be the saddest phrase in America, says Samuel Popkin, political scientist at UC San Diego. And the schools must share some blame. While Americans know about as much about politics as they did in the 1940s, they have gone to school longer now than they did fifty years ago: on average, more than twelve years today as compared with less than nine then.

¹ Daniel Yankelovich, "Three Destructive Trends," The Kettering Review, Fall 1995.

Not surprisingly, various recent surveys confirm growing cynicism about politics and government among high school and college students as well as among adults. As recently as March 30, 1996 the New York Times reported interviews with dozens of college students and young white-collar as well as blue-collar workers and young people on welfare. They found that "young workers are increasingly dissatisfied, disillusioned, and frustrated with the political system." On March 31, 1996 Gordon Black, a pollster for Ross Perot, reported that voter desire for a third party had risen to a peak of 60 percent in 1992, but after a drop in 1994 the Louis Harris "alienation index," which measures voter dissatisfaction and loss of empowerment has now risen to a record 67 percent.

One of the most wide-ranging of such reports is entitled "Breaking Ranks," sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. The staff writer and former New York Times education editor, Gene Maeroff, summarized the findings in Education Week Commentary March 6, 1996. He calling apathy and anonymity the twin scourges of modern post-adolescence. The study documents the ways the larger society "teeming with cynicism over authority, government, and almost all of life's institutional dimensions" stokes similar feelings among the young, saying in effect "responsibility to community is for chumps."

Nevertheless, Maeroff argues that the schools must struggle "to persuade teenagers of the merits of learning and to inculcate within them an appreciation of civic virtue." Much of the report deals with the needed restructuring of schools, but I emphasize its stress upon relating academic pursuits to the worlds that young people inhabit and connecting the content of the curriculum to real-life applications of knowledge and skills by requiring students to meet performance standards aligned with assessment of what is taught.

The report concludes that schools must do all they can to promote a sense of responsibility and to rebuild community. It advocates that high schools predicate their very existence on the same democratic and civil values to which the country supposedly pays fealty: "The future of the American experiment in democracy depends on the outcome, because nationhood will wither if anonymity and apathy continue to proliferate among the young." Thus, the report recommends that all high schools "advocate and model" a set of core values rebutting the misguided notion that high schools should straddle questions of values by remaining neutral. "There is no neutrality where virtue is at issue" when it comes to weapons, drugs, and violence. So the report recommends "nurturing a feeling for the common good" by requiring students to participate in service learning. (2)

There is, of course, scepticism in the educational profession and in the public about such "requirements" on the grounds that schools cannot do much or should not try to counteract the relentless intrusion of social problems into the classroom (Stephen O'Connor in a New York Times OpEd piece on March 26, 1996). Or that government has no business taking sides on matters of values. But I believe that the effort to solve this problem must be made on as many fronts as possible. I shall try to mention just a few. They range from moral philosophy to politics to parenthood.

"The Politics of Virtue"

One of the more popular demands for schools to combat the social ills that pervade the land is to teach moral values. The pleas for teaching virtue now range across the political and intellectual spectrum from conservative to centrist to liberal. At one extreme, activists of the

² Gene I. Maeroff summarizes the report Breaking Ranks in an article entitled "Apathy and Anonymity" in Education Week, March 6, 1996.

Christian Coalition deplore the absence of traditional, religiously-based morality in the schools and demand school-wide prayer and the teaching of creationism in public schools. Many centrists and liberals argue for a more generalized "character education." President and Mrs. Clinton have dwelt on themes dealing with moral imperatives, access of students to free religious expression in public schools, community service, and school uniforms to help develop a sense of community.

Many of you will remember the story by Howard Fineman in Newsweek on "The Virtuecrats" (June 13, 1994) with its cover highlighting three not-too-complimentary drawings of William Bennett flanked by Lynn Cheney and Hillary Clinton. Since then, nearly all political candidates in the 1994 election, Democratic, Republican, and Independent, have been celebrating the importance of reasserting the values of moral virtue as a means of combating the social and personal ills that pervade the land. I have several thick file folders with clippings on this theme covering the past decade or so.

The pleas for virtue now ranging across the political and intellectual spectrum of views indicate that there is a great public yearning for answers to the prevailing view that the moral fibre of the nation is weakening. Among the calls for action are strengthening the traditional values associated with family, character, and trust in personal, sexual, economic, and social relationships. I will not venture to categorize the major players or their educational prescriptions for cure in the time I have. But demand for better character education has received great impetus across the country.

You may recall that Fineman rather cavalierly identified three strains of pushing and pulling for more "character education." There are the "Scouts" who put their faith in volunteerism, especially when motivated by religious or charitable sentiment, rather than by government action. These are the modern day Toquevillians who would work primarily through the many voluntary associations of civil society. There are the "McGuffeys" who stress the role of injecting character or moral education into all of the academic subjects and the community life of public schools as well as private. And there are the "Preachers" who insist that character and morality must rest upon religion (usually meaning some variation of Christianity) and that parents must be given the public funds or vouchers to send their children to private and religious schools, or, at the very least, they are entitled to prayer in the public schools. Activists ranging from the Christian Coalition to academics like Stephen Carter deplore the absence of religiously-based morality in schools.

Typical views of political conservatives, irreverently called "virtuemeisters" by Barbara Ehrenreich, include: William Bennett's Book of Virtues which remained on the best seller list for 70 or 80 weeks; Newt Gingrich's plans To Renew America by replacing the welfare state with an opportunity society and teaching Americans about the core values of American civilization; and the political efforts of Pat Robertson, Pat Buchanan, and the Christian Coalition to require prayer in the public schools.

Meanwhile, a more civically oriented theme on behalf of virtue comes from political centrists and liberals like Hillary Rodham Clinton whose culminating argument in her best selling book It Takes a Village is that "children are citizens too" and should receive better instruction in civics, government, and history as well as what it is that binds this diverse, pluralistic country together. President Bill Clinton argued in his 1996 State of the Union address that "Each of us must hold high the torch of citizenship in our own lives....in our relentless search for common ground." And in other speeches of the past year, he has dwelt on character themes dealing with moral imperatives, access of students to free religious expression in public schools, and a renewed devotion to community service and school uniforms to help develop a sense of the common ground.

In the middle of this continuum of concern for virtue are the Communitarians who have already sponsored two White House Conferences on "Character Education for a Democratic, Civil Society," and who will hold a third conference on the same theme on June 6-8 at the White House and on Capitol Hill. These conferences grew out of Amitai Etzioni's The Spirit of Community. This year the invitation emphasizes the bipartisan character of the event. Meetings will be held on Capitol Hill as well as at the White House with addresses by the President or First Lady as well as by Republican Senator Nancy Landon Kassebaum and Democratic Senator Bill Bradley. The goal is to promote character education in the schools by "instilling in our youth the behaviors of self-discipline and empathy that are so critical to a democratic, civil society." Seven task forces will deal with such themes as involving families in schools, better ways of teaching about human relations, intimacy, building character through sports, community relations, and civic education.

Themes emphasizing behavioral approaches to character education have received an increasing amount of public and professional attention in recent years. In my view, they generally tend to subordinate the political aspects of character development in deference to their orientations to sociology, psychology, or religion. To oversimplify the point, their stress is on moral virtue based on religion rather more than on civic virtue based on the values of democratic citizenship. I believe this "moral" approach makes it harder to find a comfortable place in the curriculum and the teaching in public schools. The conference Task Force on Civic Education makes a provocative distinction between "private character" and "public character" as its basis for preferring the goal of civic education in public schools. I shall come back to this point in my concluding remarks. Virtue and character have also appeared in academic volumes ranging across a wide spectrum of political outlooks. (3)

Virtue has appeared front and center in much of the recent intellectual, academic, psychological, and philosophical discourse of liberals and "progressives" as well as in populist politics of conservative religious persuasion. I have looked at some of the recent scholarly literature to see what is being said about civic virtue and the role of education for civitas. I confess that I find relatively little about the role public education should play in shaping the values of our common American citizenship. But a great deal is said about the moral education provided by "civil society," those voluntary associations praised by De Tocqueville that lie between government and the individual, stemming from religious, social, economic, or charitable motivations.

I find more rewarding for the study of civitas in the schools the views set forth in the scholarly work in normative political philosophy sponsored by the joint efforts of the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association during the dozen years leading up to the Bicentennial of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. (4) Much of this

³ Seedbeds of Virtue: Sources of Competence, Character, and Citizenship in American Society edited by Mary Ann Glendon and David Blankenhorn; The Content of America's Character: Recovering Civic Virtue, edited by Don Eberly; Trust by Francis Fukuyama; Democracy on Trial by Jean Elshtain; Liberal Purposes: Goods, Virtues, and Diversity in the Liberal State by William Galston; and The Culture of Disbelief and Integrity by Stephen L. Carter [whom Barbara Ehrenreich in a Time book review of March 25 called one of Clinton's candidates for "official moralist of the center left."]

⁴ See, e.g., the volumes of Project 87 entitled "this Constitution" edited by Shellah Mann, and carried on in more recent years by such studies as Amy Gutmann's Democratic Education, Benjamin Barber's An Aristocracy for Everyone: the Politics of Education and the Future of America, Ralph Ketcham's Individualism and Public Life, and Lorraine Smith Pangle and Thomas L. Pangle's The Learning of Liberty: the Educational Ideas of the American Founders.

scholarship flowed into curriculum materials produced by the law-related education movement of the 1970s and 80s. (5) I tried to summarize some of that scholarship in the chapter on "A Defensible Conception of Citizenship" in my two books, The Morality of Democratic Citizenship: Goals for Civic Education in the Republic's Third Century (1988) and The Civic Mission in Educational Reform: Perspectives for the Public and the Profession (1989).

A quite recent example of this normative approach to political philosophy is Michael Sandel's lead article in the March Atlantic Monthly entitled "America's Search for a New Public Philosophy," adapted from his new book, Democracy's Discontent just published by Harvard Press. Sandel does not deal directly with education in the article, but his revealing history of the "republican" and "liberal" ideas that went into America's original conception of citizenship provides a foundation for dealing with education for civitas that I wish to develop in the final stages of this lecture.

Sandel argues that neither the politics of mistrust of government nor the politics of virtue based solely on the voluntary activities of civil society face the deeper problem concerning "the public philosophy by which we live and the conception of citizenship that informs our political debates. American politics has lost its civic voice. Despite their disagreements, liberals and conservatives share an impoverished vision of citizenship, leaving them unable to address the anxiety and frustration abroad in the land."

America's public philosophy has had two major strands that will be familiar to students of political philosophy: the traditional republican view generated in classical times and the liberal views of the 17th and 18th centuries. "Republican" and "liberal" in their historical senses are difficult for us ordinary citizens to cope with, because in their historical meanings they sometimes sound as if they are just the opposite of the way those terms are often used in political discourse today.

Sandel describes briefly these two major strands in American public philosophy: The "liberal" tradition of the 17th and 18th centuries centers on a procedural politics by which government simply provides a neutral set of procedures for the protection of those rights which enable individuals freely to choose their own values and goals. Neutral procedural government does not try to form the character or cultivate virtue among its citizens.

The "republican" tradition, generated in classical Greece and Rome, requires a formative politics in which citizens are expected to deliberate about the common good on the basis of a knowledge of public affairs and also a sense of belonging, a concern for the whole, a moral bond with the community whose fate is at stake, and thus they are enabled to shape the destiny of the political community:

"To share in self-rule therefore requires that citizens possess, or come to acquire, certain civic virtues. But this means that republican politics cannot be neutral toward the values and ends its citizens espouse. The republican conception of freedom, unlike the liberal conception, requires a formative politics, a politics that cultivates in citizens the qualities of character that self-government requires."

These traditions have interacted in American politics in curious ways at different times. Sandel puts it this way:

⁵ E.g., the Center for Civic Education, the Constitutional Rights Foundation, the American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship, the Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University, the Merahon Center at Ohio State University, and other contributors to law-related education.

"Both the liberal and the republican understandings of freedom have been present throughout our political experience, but in shifting measure and relative importance. In recent decades the civic, or formative, aspect of our politics has given way to a procedural republic, concerned less with cultivating virtue than with enabling persons to choose their own values. This shift sheds light on our discontent. For despite its appeal, the [traditional] liberal vision of freedom lacks the civic resources to sustain self-government. The public philosophy by which we live cannot secure the liberty it promises, because it cannot inspire the sense of community and civic engagement that liberty requires."

So, as we consider this historic moment in educational reform, shall we be guided by a public philosophy of mistrust of government and thus limit it to the barest minimum of "procedural" affairs? Or shall we be guided by a public philosophy of civic virtue that believes republican government and public schools rightly should have a formative role in developing among citizens the civic virtues of constitutional democracy?

To oversimplify: Many Republicans in Congress and in the states want the federal government to be neutral or "procedural" toward education by removing regulations requiring affirmative action for minorities in order to free the states, localities, and parents to follow their own desires in schooling for their children, but they also want the government to be "formative" by promoting private virtue through prayer or creationism in the public schools and by providing public funds for private and religious schools.

Many Democrats want the government to protect freedom of individuals by being neutral or "procedural" with regard to religion in public schools, but "formative" of good citizenship through affirmative actions to insure equality of opportunity for all children through public education from kindergarten through college years.

I do not pretend to reconcile these differences today. I simply ask you to concentrate on ways that education in the schools can promote a better model of citizenship, teach civic character, and learn the lessons inhering in the icons of civic virtue required by a constitutional democratic republic.

So I ask: At this historic moment of debate over the role of government in American life, shall we be guided by a public philosophy of mistrust of politics and thus limit government to the barest minimum of "procedural" affairs? Or shall we be guided by a public philosophy of civic virtue that believes a republican form of government and public education rightly have "formative" roles to play in developing the civic virtue of citizens in a constitutional democracy?

These questions over the role of government in American life lead to a second set of questions regarding educational reform: Shall we be guided by the politics of the free market in education or the politics of national standards in education? Will a free market in education or will nationwide educational standards lead us to a better education for civitas?

The free market in educational reform

I do not very often agree with Chester Finn of the conservative Hudson Institute, but I think he had one thing right when he wrote in a recent article that since the first education summit of governors called by President Bush at Charlottesville in 1989 "...the politics of school reform have heated up and grown more partisan, so much so that education-policy differences could well emerge as a defining issue in the upcoming election (as they already have in Washington

budget battles)." (6) He then proceeds to castigate "ostriches" on both the political left and the political right who are standing in the way of his own cherished goals for educational reform: vouchers for parents to send their children to private and religious schools; charter schools that are spreading like wildfire; and the privatizing of the management of public schools. He condemns the educational establishment and teachers unions of the "left" for denying the value of these free market reforms. But then Finn goes on to criticize the ostriches of the political "right" for opposing the good elements in the standards-based strategies for educational reform.

On one side of these differences is the view that the free market should set the standards for the conduct and curriculum of schools, relying chiefly on parental rights, vouchers, charter schools, and privatization. On the other side is the view that academic scholars, professional educators with the approval of state and local governments should define educational standards that all students in all schools are expected to meet to the best of their ability.

Parental rights in education have gained a new popularity since the 1994 election. One example is a bill introduced in the Senate by Republican Charles Grassley in December 1995 and in the House of Representatives by Republican freshman Steve Largent with 125 co-sponsors for "A Parental Rights and Responsibilities Act." The bill is designed to codify federal laws so that individual parents may be permitted to become the prime or sole judges of what the public schools should teach their children. In part, it says "no federal, state, or local government...shall interfere with or usurp the right of a parent to direct the upbringing of the child of the parent."

Even more important may be the effort in 28 states (so far) to introduce "parental rights" in state laws or amendments of state constitutions. The usual wording is something like "The right of parents to direct the upbringing and education of their children shall not be infringed." These proposed amendments and even their wording hark back to the Oregon case of 1925, *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*. The Christian Coalition, now with a formal arm called the Roman Catholic Alliance, and other conservative religious groups are pushing this movement in order to codify and enlarge the rights of parents under the Oregon case, namely to protect parents against government intrusion on their rights to educate their children.

I cannot pursue the details of this particular "free market" approach to American education, but it is necessary to keep in mind the whole argument of the landmark Supreme Court decisions of the 1920s. When I was teaching and writing about the history of education at Teachers College in the 1930s and 1940s, I did not anticipate that my discussion of these "charters" for parental rights in American constitutional law would continue to be relevant to a hotpoint of political controversy fifty years later. The *Pierce* case does indeed disallow an Oregon law of 1922 that required all normal children aged 8 to 16 to attend public schools only. Disallowing this law, the Court said:

"Under the doctrine of *Meyer v. Nebraska*...we think it entirely plain that the Act of 1922 unreasonably interferes with the liberty of parents and guardians to direct the upbringing and education of children under their control. As often heretofore pointed out, rights guaranteed by the Constitution may not be abridged by legislation which has no reasonable relation to some purpose within the competence of the State. The fundamental theory upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for

⁶ "On Governors and Ostriches," Education Week, February 14, 1996.

additional obligations."

Now what are these "additional obligations" for which parents have the "high duty" to prepare their children? The *Pierce* decision itself answers that question very clearly. The state has the power

"reasonably to regulate all schools, to inspect, supervise and examine them, their teachers and pupils; to require... that certain studies plainly essential to good citizenship must be taught, and that nothing be taught which is manifestly inimical to the public welfare." (Emphasis added)

I quote these words to remind parental rights advocates that the state requirement for all schools to teach civics and government was part of the original Supreme Court charter for parental rights and that parents have the high duty to send their children to schools that teach good citizenship. I notice that a federal judge in Cincinnati recently upheld an Ohio state law that requires nonpublic schools to administer the state's proficiency tests for the 9th grade, including one in citizenship. He ruled that taking part in the testing program was not too great a burden on private schools, given the state's compelling interest in the education of its citizens. Under *Pierce*, parents have the right to choose the school to which they send their children, but an education for civitas must remain a top priority and requirement for all parties: government, schools, parents, and students.

Vouchers. Another approach to the free market in education that has to do with vouchers is now often called "scholarships," to enable parents to receive public money to send their children to private and religious schools, which *Pierce* guarantees they have the freedom to do. I believe the effect of vouchers in the long run will undermine the very idea of a common school designed to prepare students for their role as citizens in a democratic republic. I say this not only from my studies of history during the past fifty years but also from my direct experience in California during the past twenty years.

In the 1970s and 80s, several attempts were made to amend the California State Constitution by repealing the article that says "The Legislature shall provide for a system of common schools..." (7) Important to this history is the free market ideology of Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago economics department and now of Stanford's Hoover Institution. But it began to get greater political attention in the late 1970s when John Coons and Stephen Sugarman of the UC Berkeley Law School turned their book Education by Choice into a political initiative campaign to amend the California state constitution to redefine the meaning of "common schools." This would permit public funds to be used by parents to send their children to private and parochial schools.

I debated Coons on a couple of occasions, including a panel at San Jose State University in April 1979. My remarks were published in the Phi Delta Kappan (September 1979) under the title "Education Vouchers: the Private Pursuit of the Public Purse." I wrote a Commentary piece for the Los Angeles Times on Sunday, September 9 saying that California should not adopt vouchers because public schools are the foundation of our democracy. This was followed by my appearance with Coons on a Los Angeles TV talk show on CBS Channel 2 called Talkabout on the same theme. It was broadcast at 1:30 p.m. on Sunday, December 23, 1979. You can imagine how many people listened to it, but nevertheless Coon's proposal foreshadowed much of the present debate. Its intention was to repeal the article in the California Constitution that states

⁷ The rationale for the initiative was set forth in books by John Coons and Stephen Sugarman of the UC Berkeley Law School, Family Choice in Education: A Model State System for Vouchers (1971) and Education by Choice: The Case for Family Control (1978).

"The Legislature shall provide for a system of common schools..." The original draft of Coons' proposed amendment states starkly that "common schools" should be redefined into three types: public schools, independent public schools, and family choice schools. The final proposal, however, tried to give more palatable names to the same three types of "common schools":

- "public schools"—publicly owned, funded, and administered
- "public scholarship schools"—organized by the authority of public school districts or public institutions of higher learning and certified to redeem scholarships. (Note the similarity to, if not the origin of, "charter schools.")
- "private scholarship schools"—organized privately and certified to redeem publicly funded scholarships.

My response to Coon's proposal was summed up substantially as follows:

"Let me remind you of the historic meaning of "common school" as formulated over the 200 years since the founding of the Republic and incorporated now in virtually all fifty state constitutions:

Common to all students of the community to attend freely together (all classes, all religions, all nationalities, all languages) Common studies "plainly essential to good citizenship" Supported by common tax funds with no public funds going to religious schools Controlled by public officials representing the whole community rather than by segments made up of kin, class, race, religion, language, or ethnicity The fundamental reason for developing this distinctive idea of a common school was that it was the surest guarantee that succeeding generations would be prepared for their common rights and responsibilities of citizenship; as essential to a democratic political system as are fair and impartial courts and elected representative assemblies; absolutely essential to achieve and maintain political unum in a society marked by great pluribus. The issue then is—shall California reject that tradition and make public schools simply one alternative for family choice; or shall public schools be recalled to their historic mission visualized by Jefferson, Horace Mann, and the main decisions of the Supreme Court on religious freedom and racial equality.

In any event, these initiatives failed to get enough signatures to be placed on the 1982 ballot in California. But the basic idea spread nationwide in the mid-1980s with the encouragement of the Reagan administration and Attorney General Ed Meese, stirring fierce public debate over whether vouchers and prayers in public schools violated the meaning of the establishment clause of the First Amendment. I wrote a short monograph published by People for the American Way entitled "Religion, Education, and the First Amendment" in 1985 detailing the arguments pro and con regarding the meaning of the establishment clause of the First Amendment.

The movement for vouchers, now often given the more familiar and less politically loaded term "scholarships" and aimed at evoking the GI Bill of Rights scholarships has gained considerable headway. But the movement today marshalls the idea that private scholarships will be of special help to the poor and the underprivileged rather than to the private religious schools. And the constitutional issue now is largely muted in public debates, but I believe it will not go away unless the Supreme Court tilts even more heavily to the "conservative" judicial position widely referred to in the 1980s as the "original intent" of the founders of the First Amendment. The key question in that debate is what does the "establishment religion clause of the First Amendment mean? The key principle stated in *Everson v. Board of Education* in 1947 is this:

The "establishment of religion clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government... can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another....No tax in any

amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion....In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to 'erect a wall of separation against Church and State.'

I think we won the historical argument about the First Amendment's establishment clause in the 1980s, and that may be why it is seldom brought up in the mid-1990s. But the conservative wing of the Supreme Court is still poised to argue that Jefferson's phrase was only a rhetorical metaphor and should be erased from constitutional and political discourse. In fact, the present election of 1996 is not only about who dominates the Congress and the Presidency but also about who gets to nominate and approve the next justices of the Supreme Court. If the Republicans win both the presidency and the Congress, a new majority on the Supreme Court may well overturn the *Everson* doctrine in order to permit larger public support for religious schools. Justices Rehnquist, Scalia, and White have already indicated they would do this. In their minority decision on the *Jaffree* case of 1985 in which the majority outlawed prayers in the public schools, they argued that the "wall of separation of church and state is simply a metaphor based on bad history." I believe, on the contrary, that the great weight of historical scholarship supports the *Everson* doctrine. (8)

Charter schools. A third variation on the free market approach is the charter school movement. I certainly would not enter this debate here in its Minnesota seedbed. You all know far more about the matter than I could ever know. But I have read some reports, including one of the most complete and objective studies made so far, recently issued by the Indiana University Education Policy Center.⁽⁹⁾ My impression from that report is that charter schools say very little about education for civitas, except for occasional references to "community experience." The report clearly defines the arguments for and against charter school, analyzes charter school laws in all 19 states that had passed laws up to September 1995, summarizes and analyzes existing research studies about the schools then operating across the country, and offers recommendations to policymakers and legislators who are considering whether or not to establish or modify charter schools, and if so whether the legislation should be expansive or restrictive.

I was struck by the wording originally used by Ted Kolderie to define a charter school: "an autonomous, results-oriented, publicly funded school of choice that is designed and run by teachers or other operators under contract with a public sponsor." I obviously was looking for what charter schools believed their obligation to civic education might be. I found relatively little in Buechler's study, except for occasional references to "community experience." Whether the attention given to "thematic-interdisciplinary instruction" or "back-to-basics core/curriculum" might include civics or government, I could not tell. Since the very idea of charter schools is to be exempt from state education laws and regulations I wonder how many charter schools have chosen to follow state curriculum frameworks in civics and government.

I have also read the brief survey of charter schools in seven states made by the conservative Hudson Institute's project. Again, I found little or nothing about the need for a curriculum

⁸ See my original study, The Tradition of Religion and Education in America (1950) and more recently, Religion, Education, and the First Amendment (1986). The most exhaustive and reliable studies are by Leonard Levy, The Establishment Clause: Religion and the First Amendment (1986) and Original Intent and the Framers' Constitution (1988).

⁹ "Charter Schools; Legislation and Results after Four Years" by Mark Buechler, Indiana University School of Education, January 1996.

dealing with the public good or the goal of citizenship, except that two or three of the 35 schools in the survey include "community service" and that the school called City on a Hill in Boston provides a "strong liberal arts core curriculum, including a program of public service and civic responsibility." (10)

I also noted two recent stories in Education Week about City on a Hill in Boston in which public-service projects and weekly New England-style "town meetings" bring the fundamentals of civics to life for students. President Clinton endorsed charter schools and mentioned the City on a Hill in his first inaugural address. Obviously, I could only hope for the success of a school built on that rationale and hope that it would stimulate other schools to devote themselves to similar goals and to a commitment to public service. How could one who oversaw the training of 500 Teachers for East Africa and 2500 Peace Corps teachers as I did at Teachers College in the 1960s think otherwise?

The Privatization of public schools.

Finally, I find little or nothing about education for civitas in the projects by non-profit organizations advocating "restructuring and reinventing schools" or by profit-making organizations advocating "educational alternatives" that seek to bring better business practices into the management of public schools and still make money for their stockholders. (11) Rather, I find praise for the superiority of decentralized decision-making and on-site management, deregulation from state and federal requirements, accountability, high-tech computer literacy, parental involvement, economic competitiveness, and better back-to-basics pedagogy as well as an emphasis on "individual learning styles." The latter phrase often sounds very much like the "progressive education" views prevalent when I was a neophyte on the faculty of Teachers College in the 1930s and 1940s.

I cannot plunge into the present debates over privatization here. I simply recall some headlines that an interested observer could not miss in the daily press as well as in the professional press: "Lure of the Education Market Remains Strong for Business" (New York Times 1/31/96); "Brokers Pitch Education as Hot Investment" (Education Week 2/21/96); and "Potential Investors Watch as For-Profit Education Comes of Age" (Education Week 3/20/96). I repeat, now as a question, What effect will the free market approach to educational reform have on public education's goal for civitas as a high duty serving the public good in a republican system of government? At least, I would argue that all proposed privatizing projects must guarantee that the high duty of citizenship and obligation for the public good of the republic will be lessons that their teachers must learn, their students must learn, and their proprietors, promoters, administrators, and overseers must learn.

Two years ago, in the wake of the Republican revolution in Congress, the then Deputy Director of the Hudson Institute's Educational Excellence Network, Michael Garber, stated candidly, if not gleefully, "What the GOP Victories Mean for Education." (12) I quote: "Though the revolution may be protracted, Republicans should fire the

¹⁰ See Chester E. Finn, Jr., Louann A. Bierlein, and Bruno V. Manno, "Charter Schools in Action: A First Look" in Network News and Views, March 1996. For fuller details about City on a Hill, see articles in Education Week (January 10, 1996 and March 27, 1996 by Meg Summerfield.

¹¹ I have in mind such projects and coalitions as those being promoted by TheodoreSizer, Howard Gardner, James P. Comer, Chris Whittle's Edison Project, the New America Schools Corporation, Education Alternatives Incorporated, and two projects whose headquarters are at Teachers College, Columbia University: the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching; and the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. etc.

¹² Excellence Network News and Views, December 1994

opening shot, directing their small-government, anti-regulation, free market inclinations to breaking up the largest single public monopoly in the free world - the \$300 billion per year public education industry."

Such a view of the Republican revolution raises these serious questions: Will the several free market approaches to educational reform increase or stem the politics of mistrust in government? Will they promote or neglect the education for civic virtue necessary to serve the public good of a republican form of government? Will they supplement or will they threaten the very idea of a common public education itself? Will they water down or even defeat the goals for nationwide standards of achievement visualized by the bipartisan efforts of the past dozen years?

The Urgency of National Standards in Education for Civitas

The bipartisan movement for national standards stemming from the Charlottesville summit of President Bush and the governors in 1989 is now fracturing under the Republican revolution. Every candidate for the Republican nomination during the 1996 primaries denounced the idea of national education standards and advocated trimming down or cutting out the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, which was passed by the Democratic Congress in 1994. Urged on by two former Secretaries of Education, William Bennett and Lamar Alexander, Republican candidates favored the abolishment of the U.S. Department of Education.

The crescendo of attacks upon public education, efforts by local groups to censor the curriculum, tests, and texts, and the campaigns to inject religion into public schools and promote private and religious schools at public expense threaten to undermine the Jefferson-Lincoln-La Follette ideals in many states of the Union. From what I can read about the most highly publicized and well financed movements of this type in the early 1990s, they have paid precious little attention to improving civic education in either private or public schools.

My own judgment is that free market projects in educational reform should be funded by the voluntary private agencies of civil society rather than by federal, state, or local public funds. Better to use public funds to bolster and improve public education by enabling it to do a better job of achieving its historic, primary goal of providing a universal, free, common education for civitas. I believe that the National Standards for Civics and Government and its predecessor volume CIVITAS provide a sound 21st century rationale for this task. They could be powerful antidotes for our current sour mood of "antipolitics" and the politics of mistrust. They could be positive aids to "recivilizing" our political understanding and discourse.

Drawing heavily upon CIVITAS: A Framework for Civic Education, a companion volume published in 1991, the Civics Standards set forth as clearly as possible what all citizens need to know if they are to understand and become rationally committed to the fundamental values and principles of American constitutional democracy. Hard as it may be to achieve, I believe that these civic values and principles should be core elements of study from earliest schooling through higher education.

It will not be easy, but a gigantic effort must be launched to counteract the superficial political opinions of citizens now molded by TV attack-ads, by radio squawk-talk, and by organized floods of faxes, what Michael Wines called the "electronic din" of a "500-channel democracy." (New York Times, 10/16/94). The public is easily influenced by negative campaigning because citizens know less than they need to know about what government is and should do. The only long-term hope of revivifying a cynical electorate is serious and sustained study and learning of the basic principles of constitutional democracy.

The National Standards for Civics and Government recall American education to that civic mission in ways that will enable citizens to cope with the modern world of the 21st century.

They in effect provide us with a new edition of a "text of civic instruction" designed to achieve national education goals for all students in all schools. As Jefferson argued nearly two centuries ago, what other hope is there for Republicans and Democrats to become "brethren of the same principle?" In a democracy, a healthy electorate is the only sure cure for ailing politicians and government. That's why the electorate needs a reinvigorating and reenergizing civic education.

In fact, it took great effort by many persons, both educators and political leaders, to convince the National Education Standards Panel (set up by the Goals legislation) to add civics and government to the list of five core studies, which had originally been limited to English, science, math, history, and geography. It is ironic that ultimately the civics standards received the widest acceptance of all the completed standards. The U.S. History Standards met with harsh criticism from Lynn Cheney and from other conservative leaders, including the almost unanimous condemnation in a resolution passed by the U.S. Senate. And federal funding for the English Standards was withdrawn because of dissatisfaction expressed by the U.S. Department of Education. When the national standards for U.S. History and for English came under this withering criticism from politicians, publicists, and educators alike, the very idea of national standards in general was endangered.

In contrast, the National Standards for Civics and Government have been almost universally acclaimed. The civics standards were prepared by the non-profit, non-partisan Center for Civic Education through an extensive and intensive consensus-building process in which some 3,000 individuals and organizations took part. More than 150 open hearings and public discussions were held in which a broad range of political views was expressed. More than 1,000 specific written suggestions were received from informed commentators. Since their unveiling at the Supreme Court in September 1991, the standards have received endorsements from officers of a broad spectrum of academic, professional, civic, religious, business and labor groups. (13)

The civics standards set forth what all citizens must know if they are to become rationally committed to American constitutional democracy. They are organized around five fundamental questions:

1. What is government and what should it do?
2. What are the basic values and principles of American democracy?
3. How does the government established by the Constitution embody the values and principles of American democracy?
4. What is the relationship of the United States to other nations and to world affairs?
5. What are the roles of citizens in American democracy?

In March 1996 when the Governing Board of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) unanimously adopted a framework for its 1998 nationwide tests in civics, it voted to use the civics standards as guidelines. At about the same time, the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) also adapted them for its

¹³ Support for the national standards has come from former Chief Justice Burger, Democratic Senator Claiborne Pell, Republican Senator Mark Hatfield, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Association of Evangelicals, the National Catholic Educational Association, the California Council for the Social Studies, the American Federation of Teachers, the Association of American Publishers, and scores of well-known university scholars, school teachers, and administrators across the land. The standards have been disseminated by many professional and academic organizations, including the American Bar Association, the American Political Science Association, the American Association of School Administrators, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Council for Teacher Education, and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

scheduled 1998 assessment of civic education in 25 countries.

In civic education, we are well on the way to defining the rigorous "world class standards" in core subjects that were proposed in the 1983 report of the Excellence Commission appointed by President Reagan, by the first summit of the governors called by President Bush in 1989, and by the second summit of governors and business leaders in March 1996. At a time when the nurturing of political democracy is vital to the whole world, the national standards movement in the United States must not be derailed.

Neither the civics standards nor its companion volume CIVITAS was devised by bureaucrats in Washington. Both were formulated by scholarly consensus regarding the core civic values and principles that should be taught in all American schools, public and private. They are exemplary, voluntary guidelines for the civic education conducted by public and private schools. They are quietly achieving the widely desired purposes of national standards without the divisive debates that erupted over the history and English standards.

CIVITAS and the Icons of Civic Virtue

Let me say a special word about the volume entitled CIVITAS, which provides the substantive scholarly background for the questions posed by the civics standards. Its Framework Development Committee consisted of 19 scholars in political science, constitutional law, and education. Its National Review Council of 24 civic leaders was chaired by the late Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. It received the consensus of a 60-member Teachers Advisory Committee drawn from all 50 states. Every topic in CIVITAS presents a conceptual perspective, an historical perspective, and a contemporary perspective. The three major topics for study are:

- I. Civic Virtue
- II. Civic Participation
- III. Civic Knowledge and Skills

CIVITAS revives the term "civic virtue" not only to call to mind the founding experience of the American Republic, but also to highlight the civic character needed by American citizens as they confront an increasingly complex, fractious, and interdependent world. Don't discount the power of "virtue" in a period when Bill Bennett's Book of Virtues has remained on the best seller list for more than 80 straight weeks. Or when Colin Powell's book has become instantaneously wildly popular, not least because he calls for a revival of patriotism as a civic virtue. Much of the public is listening, reading, and applauding "virtue."

CIVITAS, however, focuses on the civic aspects of virtue by concentrating on such civic dispositions and commitments as: civility, individual responsibility and self-discipline, civic-mindedness and open-mindedness, compromise and negotiation, respect for the rights of others, respect for the law, critical mindedness, patience and persistence, compassion, generosity, and loyalty. CIVITAS also discusses the more familiar principles and structures of American government usually dealt with in civics textbooks and courses: popular sovereignty, the rule of law, separation of powers, checks and balances, separation of church and state, and federalism. But notice again. Even those usually dusty and dull topics are undergoing fundamental, historic reexamination these days. Note how every one of these topics is the subject of this election year's debates over the future role of government in American life.

In my view, the most distinctive aspect of CIVITAS, which makes it so different from most civics textbooks or curriculum frameworks, is its emphasis upon civic virtue, clearly outlining the fundamental civic values of American constitutional democracy as subjects for study as well as for eventual reasoned commitment by all citizens.

Let me mention briefly the seven civic values which constitute the core of the civitas lessons

that Americans must learn. In the spirit of the Age of Cyberspace and in the hope that these values and ideas will find prominent home pages on the World Wide Web and permanent places on the computer monitors of students and public alike. I call them:

THE SEVEN ICONS OF CIVIC VIRTUE

I. THE PUBLIC GOOD

The first icon of a republican government and of education for civitas derives from the classical civic tradition that obligates citizens to subordinate their private interests to the public good when necessary to form a more perfect union, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, and promote the general welfare. Drawing upon the classical republican tradition of politics, the founders of the American republic used the term "civic virtue" to mean the willingness of citizens to subordinate their private interests on behalf of the public or common good. But the founders also drew upon the 17th and 18th century liberal tradition, which viewed the chief end of government to be the prime protector of the individual rights of citizens in a democratic republic. CIVITAS says that both the classical republican tradition and the traditional liberal view of citizenship are legitimate elements in the spectrum of American civic values and both have a balanced place in the scholarly curriculum of education for civic virtue in the future.

II. FREEDOM OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

A second icon of republican government and of education for civitas seeks to secure the blessings of liberty and to act as prime protector of the liberal tradition of individual rights proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights: life, liberty, property, and pursuit of happiness. There are two kinds of individual rights: (1) The freedom of the person and of private action, which involves the right, the opportunity, and the ability of every person to live a life of dignity and security, and to seek self-fulfillment as an individual and as a member of a chosen group without arbitrary constraint by others. (2) The freedom of the mind and of intellectual inquiry, which involves the right, the opportunity, and the ability of every person to speak, to read, to think, to believe, to express, to learn, and to teach without arbitrary constraint or coercion by others.

III. JUSTICE

A third icon rests upon the basic concept of justice, defined in simple terms as that which is fair. A just society attempts to deal with all persons in such a way that they are treated fairly in the distribution of the benefits and burdens of society and in the correction and punishment of wrongs and injuries. It includes, but is not limited to, the civil and criminal "justice system." Justice also defines the moral basis of conduct for citizens in a democratic society. Justice is what must govern the conduct of individual persons in their relations to one another, if the society is to be self-sufficient and well-ordered as well as democratic. Justice establishes the claims of what is publicly right; it is prior to the claims of what different individuals or different groups define as privately good for themselves as they seek to achieve their own goals and to satisfy their own particular interests. A just social system sets the boundaries of the public good within which individuals and groups may develop their own distinctive pluralistic aims and desires.

IV. EQUALITY

A fourth icon is America's historic creed of equality, which decrees that all persons be treated by government and by education in such way that they have equal rights and opportunities to develop themselves to the fullest extent possible, politically, legally, socially, and economically. The idea of equality not only runs through the historic American creed of value claims in a democratic political community but also now permeates international covenants of human rights from the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights of 1945 to the Women's Conference in Beijing of 1995. America's Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal" must now be taken to mean that "all persons should be treated as though

they are equal" in their claims to the other democratic civic values. Although the physical or mental condition of all persons at birth may not be equal, they should all have equal rights to develop themselves to the fullest extent possible.

V. DIVERSITY

Respect for social and cultural diversity is another one of the glories of the American political system. In his People of Paradox (1973), Cornell University historian, Michael Kammen, makes a useful distinction between an "unstable pluralism" and a "stable pluralism." An unstable pluralism occurs when cleavages in a society are so strong that they threaten the very authority of the polity itself. This happens when each racial, ethnic, religious, or regional group forms its own political party, or militia, or its "own faction, each sect its own school, and each dogmatist his own ideology." The vicious conflicts in the states of the former Yugoslavia and Soviet Union along with those in the Middle East and Africa issue global warnings of the dangers of unstable pluralism. By contrast, a stable pluralism is based upon a strong underpinning of political legitimacy: "best insured by the rule of law - law made within a framework of an explicit constitution[S]table pluralism in a democracy also requires a strong and lasting inventory of psychological legitimacy: understanding, acceptance, and pervasive confidence in the composite system necessary to make it run smoothly rather than by fits and starts."

VI. TRUTH

A sixth icon holds that public knowledge must be reliable and valid in order to maintain trust in democratic government itself. The reliability and validity of public knowledge are major requirements in a democracy. Trust in the veracity of government constitutes an essential bond between those who govern and those who are governed. The First Amendment not only protects freedom of expression for the individual but also insures freedom for public and political discussion as a fundamental protection of constitutional government itself. These freedoms require untrammelled access to knowledge that is true, valid, and reliable. That's where knowledge of civics comes in, to help citizens in the process of "winnowing and sifting" the significant truth from the "plausible falsehood" and the "beguiling half truth" so dear to the rough and tumble of the political process in an open society.

VII. PATRIOTISM

A seventh icon of education for civitas promotes patriotism. Any defensible conception of citizenship and civic virtue must take account of the extraordinary dynamic force that patriotic sentiments play in American national life. In its best sense, patriotism binds the diverse segments of American society into an integral democratic polity. In its worst sense, it inflames a nationalistic chauvinism, setting one group against another in rival efforts to prove who are the true patriots.

Fifty years ago, noted American historian Merle Curti, in his pathfinding book The Roots of American Loyalty (1946), defined patriotism as "love of country, pride in it, and readiness to make sacrifices for what is considered its best interest." He echoes Old Bob LaFollette's call for the state university to be a prime element in forming the "character of citizenship." Too often, the voice of sacrifice, apart from military service, stands mute. Notice the response General Colin Powell received as he called for a sense of duty, discipline, and obligation as the very essence of civic virtue.

The schools cannot alone instill the necessary values of personal obligation and responsibility when other major social institutions concentrate on promoting their private interests. While most people believe the schools must play a major role in developing a humane patriotism, they disagree on whether compulsory salutes to the flag in school should be required or whether the desecration of the flag should be punishable by fine or imprisonment.

CIVITAS Coalitions Here and Abroad

I am glad to report that these CIVITAS icons of civic virtue are also receiving cordial welcome by educators in many countries of the world who are seeking democracy anew or for the first time. An international conference on civic education, itself entitled CIVITAS@Prague/1995, was attended by 400 participants representing the educational professions, governments, and mass media of 50 countries. The U.S. national civics standards and its accompanying volume CIVITAS were centerpieces of discussion about ways to teach democracy. A home page called Civnet was set up on the World Wide Web.

It is heartening that these democratic values, long suppressed by dictatorial regimes of both right and left, are now being reasserted in spectacular fashion by millions of people throughout the world - especially in Eastern Europe and in the former states of the Soviet Union. But it would be the ultimate irony of modern history if Americans, young or old, were to give in to the politics of mistrust just at a time when much of the rest of the world is clamoring for democracy and freedom in the idioms of Jefferson, Madison, and Lincoln.

Still, I am hopeful for the future. As a result of the CIVITAS conference in Prague a program of international exchanges of teachers and professors to improve civic education in their respective countries is already under way involving several U.S. universities and their counterparts in Russia, Latvia, the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, and Bosnia. On March 25-27, 1996 an organizing committee met at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg to plan a permanent, non-governmental CIVITAS-type of organization to promote the teaching of democratic values in the several regions of the world. Conferences are planned for 1996 in Florence, Washington, D.C., Buenos Aires, and Brisbane, Australia.

This vision of a cooperative international CIVITAS movement is most heartening. I hope that American educators will do no less at home. The Schools of Education at Indiana University and Ohio State University, along with the Center for Civic Education and several other educational and civic organizations, are already members of this CIVITAS coalition for international exchange. Perhaps Minnesota could be recruited along with Wisconsin, Illinois, and the other Big Ten universities to issue a "Midwest Ordinance of 1997" to promote "education for civitas" throughout the United States as well as abroad. Its mission statement could adapt the actual language and spirit of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 somewhat as follows: "Civic virtue and civic knowledge being necessary to good government, public schools, public universities, and the means of education for civitas shall forever be encouraged."

Such a coalition might finally fulfill the essence of Jefferson's own original drafts of the Ordinances of 1785 and 1787, ideas carried forward by the Morrill acts, and by such early advocates of an activist public university as "Old" Bob LaFollette, Charles Van Hise, and Alexander Meiklejohn's Experimental College at Wisconsin, and by Lotus Coffman and the General College here at Minnesota. By developing interdisciplinary core courses to energize the study of constitutional government and citizenship as an integral part of degree requirements in the several major fields of the liberal arts, you could put into effect ideas that have been circulated since the mid-1980s by such academically influential organizations as the Association of American Colleges, the Kettering Foundation's Civic Arts Review, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and Campus Compact.

For example, in 1985, Frank Newman, as newly appointed president of the Education Commission of the States, issued a very strong statement that economic progress, important as that is, is not the most urgent issue facing American higher education: "The most critical demand is to restore to higher education its original purpose of preparing graduates for a life of involved and committed citizenship."

This view was revived once again in October 1995 by Alexander Astin, professor of higher education at UCLA, in his article on "The Cause of Citizenship." (16) I quote: "If we want our students to acquire the democratic virtues....why not begin a campus-wide effort to determine how citizenship and democracy can be given a more central place in the general-education curriculum?....If higher education doesn't start giving citizenship and democracy much greater priority, who will? Corporate business? The news media? Politicians?"

Borrowing shamelessly from the Prague example, I herewith propose that American colleges and universities establish integrated core courses that might be called CIVITAS, offered as an integral (or even required) part of degree requirements in liberal arts studies and dealing with the role of democratic citizenship in local communities, in nations, and in the world. Such a program certainly fits nicely with the goal of "service learning" or "community learning" now so popular on many campuses.

At the very least, education for civitas should be a core requirement that runs throughout the K-12 school curriculum and the pre-service preparation as well as the continuing professional development of all teachers. I repeat, all teachers should be enabled not only to reach and teach an increasingly diverse student population but also empowered to promote the cohesive values and principles underlying our common citizenship, no matter what their specialized fields of teaching may be.

This means that the national and state groups now at work to improve the licensing and assessment of teachers and the accrediting of institutions should require study of the civic foundations of education as part of the common preparation for all teachers. (17) All of these agencies should be paying greater attention to the "civic foundations of education" as I proposed in my article in the Journal of Teacher Education (Nov.-Dec. 1993): "The Time Is Now: For Framing the Civic Foundations of Teacher Education." Only in this way will all teachers be enabled to prepare all of their students for "Student Achievement and Citizenship" as proclaimed in Goal 3 of Goals 2000. Only in this way will lasting success in educational reform be achieved and reforms in teacher education connected with certification and accreditation as intended in Goal 4, "Teacher Education and Professional Development."

In a society increasingly divided by those who preach religiously-based moral values and

¹⁵ Frank Newman, "Higher Education and the American Renaissance," Chronicle of Higher Education, September 18, 1985.

¹⁶ Alexander Astin, "The Cause of Citizenship," Education Week, October 6, 1995. For an elaborate philosophical argument for a core requirement in "civilization" in liberal education, see Charles W. Anderson, Prescribing the Life of the Mind: An Essay on the Purpose of the University, the Aims of Liberal Education, the Competence of Citizens, and the Cultivation of Practical Reason (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993). For an incisive argument that a healthy core curriculum should be the centerpiece of a revived general education, see David Damrosch, We Scholars: Changing the Culture of the University (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995).

¹⁷ For example, standards for certification of teachers are being developed by these groups: a task force of the Council of Chief State School Officers; the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards; the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, (Education Week, 11/23/94); and the New Professional Teacher Project of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (Education Week 11/30/94).

those who prefer secular-based moral values, all teachers need to learn about, as well as exemplify, civic-based moral values. This divisiveness has shown itself specifically in the widespread controversies over the U.S. History Standards. However this controversy may turn out, it is clear that the history standards have given us Pluribus and the civics standards have given us Unum. Somehow, together, history and civics must be endowed with the necessary time and the scholarly quality in the school curriculum that will enable the Republic safely to survive.

Education for Civitas a Seamless Web

In sum, civic learning must be a seamless web throughout primary and secondary schools, continuing through liberal arts colleges and schools of education. All teachers, not merely those teachers who specialize in teaching history, geography, civics, government, or social studies, need better grounding in the challenging knowledge set forth in the National Standards for Civics and Government and in CIVITAS. This general idea was broached at the Hoover Seminar on "Civic Learning in the Education of the Teaching Profession," which I chaired at Stanford in November 1984 just a week after the Reagan landslide. It was attended by 60 educators from 32 different colleges and universities and co-sponsored by ten preeminent organizations devoted to the scholarly arts and sciences and professional education. (18) But the idea of a core of civic foundations of education did not get very far following that election.

The results of recent elections at federal, state, and local levels have often reflected a general protest against government itself and support for promises to reduce and limit government. We have a unique window of opportunity to strip the study of civics of the widespread perception that it is the most boring of school subjects. Instead, it could become one of the most important and "challenging" subjects in the K-12 curriculum as well as in the liberal arts, in pre-service teacher education, and in the professional development programs for in-service teachers.

For example, consider how the study and discussion of civics courses could take on new life as a result of the mood of the current "political revolution." For example, analyze the principal arguments which run something like this:

1. Reduce the role of the federal government by cutting federal powers, regulations, and funds for education, health care, welfare, and the environment, and turn such matters over to the states, sometimes with the help of federal funds, sometimes not; abolish the U. S. Department of Education and national service through AmeriCorps; reduce or abolish federal loans and grants for college students; prevent the federal government from prohibiting guns near schools. Is this what civics textbooks mean by "federalism?" If not, what has federalism meant? What should it mean?
2. Next: After power has been passed to the states, reduce the role of state governments in education and social services, increase local control, or better yet privatize management. This means, among other things, offering public-funded vouchers to parents to choose the private or religious schools they want for their children; but not public funds for women to choose abortions for pregnancies they don't want, or funds for medical care for poor women on welfare for children they do want. Is this what the civics textbooks mean by promoting the "public good" or protecting the individual rights of "freedom" and "privacy" from invasion by government? If not, what do these concepts mean?
3. Further: "Teach traditional family values," require the teaching of creationism along with

¹⁸ See Alan H. Jones, ed., Civic Learning for Teachers: Capstone for Educational Reform (Ann Arbor: Prakken Publications, 1985)

evolution, and promote prayer in the public schools by enacting the "Religious Equality Amendment" to the U. S. Constitution. Is this what civic textbooks mean by the separation of church and state? Or what the First Amendment permits or requires? What does religious freedom mean?

4. Still further: Reduce or abolish affirmative action for minorities and women in education and in employment; drastically limit immigration and abolish educational benefits for legal as well as illegal aliens; reduce the emphasis on multiculturalism in schools and colleges. Is this what civics textbooks mean by America's historic civic values of "justice," "equality," and "diversity?" What do these values mean?
5. Finally: The courts are also wrestling with the role of government in American life. For example, in a recent case, *U.S. Term Limits v. Thornton*, the Supreme Court debated whether we Americans are a people of 50 sovereign states or of one nation. The Court narrowly decided 5-4 that "We the People" are one nation, although Justice Clarence Thomas wrote his dissent as though we should still be operating under the Articles of Confederation. Which is the better view of the role of the federal government?
6. Now: Add to this "political revolution" the public's current disenchantment with politicians of both major political parties and, underlying all else, a sense of apathy regarding government. About 30% of eligible citizens take the trouble to vote. And the proportion of younger citizens who vote is even smaller. Is this what civic textbooks mean by "popular sovereignty" and "democracy?" What should they mean?

Civics is boring? Instead, we should view 1996 as a year of unique opportunity to revive the study of civics as one of the most challenging subjects in the K-12 curriculum as well as in college liberal arts. Both high school and college students should be studying a new kind of civics that deals in a candid, lively, and scholarly way with the fundamental issues underlying the past and the future of constitutional democracy. To this end, I believe that we should require such study as a core curriculum of education offered in schools, in colleges, and in schools of education throughout the land.

And there is a still wider political dimension to the usefulness of the National Civics Standards. In his column "Turning Cynicism into Citizenship" (*Washington Post* (11/27/94), David Broder called attention to the national civics standards as a school-based effort to achieve the participatory goals of several grass roots citizenship movements: the National Civic League's "Alliance for National Renewal," the Bradley Foundation's "The New Citizenship Movement," and the American Civic Forum's "Call for a New Citizenship."

The Civics Standards have come at just the right time to bridge the gap between such community movements and the schoolrooms. In the long run, one cannot succeed without the other. If the voluntary community participation of the Tocqueville civil society is genuinely to promote the democratic values and principles of constitutional democracy, it must be linked with and cultivated by (1) the civic knowledge and values that students acquire in schools through CIVITAS and the National Civics Standards and (2) the civic knowledge and values that teachers acquire in their liberal arts and professional preparation.

Now, in an election year when educational issues are hot political buttons, perhaps it is just the time for a coalition of universities to collaborate in building scholarly non-partisan programs to educate their students and the public about civitas. No matter who wins this year's elections and no matter what role the free market may come to play in educational reform, we must achieve the goal of nationwide standards in education for civitas in order to combat the politics of mistrust and promote the values of civic virtue.

This goal requires the joint efforts of schools and universities, the media, business and labor, government, and the voluntary efforts of the civic-minded agencies of civil society. To this end, we need to mobilize scholars of related academic disciplines to work with professional educators. And we need the support of the major players of all those community and national organizations that are devoted to public education and the public good.

In the recent years of the educational reform movement we've heard from Paideia, Clio, Excellence, "Content, Character, and Choice," Effective Schools, Alternative Schools, Edison, and a lot more. Now, let's hear it for Civitas.

Above all, we need good public schools and universities, and we need public good schools and universities to lead the way. During this summer and fall of 1996, all political parties and all political points of view could profit from a nationwide discourse on the public philosophy of education for civitas.

May 1, 1997

PART II
AFTERWORD - ONE YEAR LATER
The Politics of Educational Reform

This Part II was completed on May 1, 1997, a year after I delivered the original paper on "Education for Civitas" at the University of Minnesota on May 2, 1996. Here, I do not attempt to discuss in detail the events of the intervening year, but simply to remind the reader of a few developments surrounding the politics of educational reform. In a word, the free market approach continued to compete with the movement to establish national standards of achievement in core subjects for all American children and youth as outlined in Goals 2000. So, I touch only lightly some of the major political events of the six months of campaigning prior to the November election of 1996 and in the six months following the reelection of a Republican Congress and a Democratic President. I shall follow roughly the order of topics as discussed in my May 1996 paper.

One generalization clearly evident is that educational reform itself was a high priority among voters during the primary campaigning and in the election itself after the party conventions in July and August. Opinion polls consistently reported that education was one of the highest priorities in the minds of the electorate, and this undoubtedly influenced the campaign rhetoric and proposals. In fact, it may well be true that education was a more prominent political issue in the 1996 national election than ever before. And much of it centered on the appeals to parental and private efforts of the free market approach to education in contrast to the efforts to achieve higher national standards through improving public education. Although there was a variety of views on both sides of the party spectrum during the campaign, I believe it is fair to say that by and large Republican candidates favored one or more of the free market means to reform education, while Democratic candidates favored national standards as a goal for reform of public education, thus gaining major support from organized teachers and labor.

Another generalization is that the politics of combat and conflict that marked the 1996 campaign seemed to be verging rather more toward a politics of conciliation or comity in the first few months following the election. During this time, both the White House and the Republican Congressional leadership decided that the voters were tired of the uncivil bickering over education. It is too early to determine how long that conciliation will last.

Recall that the bipartisan approval of national standards beginning with the Charlottesville summit of 1989 had resulted in passage by a Democratic Congress of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act in March 1994, but that implementation was stalled by the Republican revolution in the November elections of 1994. By the time I delivered my lecture in May of 1996 the battle lines were quite clearly drawn. President Clinton's State of the Union Address in January 1996 had highlighted Goals 2000, but he also indicated that he had moved toward "choice for public schools" and toward experiments with charter schools as well as the importance of character education, school-to-work programs, Americorps, and college loans and grants.

Then, during the primary campaigns of spring and summer in 1996, the lines of partisanship were more clearly drawn. All nine Republican candidates were generally agreed that the federal role in education should be sharply curtailed, including abolishing the U.S. Department of Education, curtailing the Goals 2000 movement toward national standards (using the history and English standards as horrible examples), elevating parental rights and vouchers for private and religious schools, and wiping out affirmative action and Americorps. But, on the other hand, they also generally favored an activist federal role to promote prayer in the public schools, even if that required a constitutional amendment, and they favored the legal establishment of English as America's national language.

In the weeks following my lecture in May, 1996 the politics of the free market in educational reform were highlighted in the Republican presidential campaign. When Senator Dole clinched the Republican candidacy for president, he urged the schools to emphasize traditional values, arguing for school choice and attacking the National Education Association as a major threat to American educational reform. The Republicans in Congress drew up a constitutional amendment favoring school prayer at the urging of the Christian Coalition, in part at least to bolster the sagging fortunes of Senator Dole. The Republican Party Platform, dominated by conservative activists, spelled out for Senator Dole the details of the free market approach:

The family, not government, is the core institution in American life; so return control of the schools to parents, decentralized school systems, teachers, local communities and taxpayers. Keep the federal government out of educational matters, because it has no constitutional authority over education. Abolish the U.S. Department of Education, promote family choice at all levels of learning, and repeal the Goals 2000 Act and School-to-Work Act of 1994, replacing them with "opportunity scholarships" (vouchers) for low and middle class parents, block grants to the states, school rebates, charter schools, and vouchers to make parental choice a reality for all parents. The Democratic Platform emphasized strengthening public education from bottom to top, expanded choice in public schools but no vouchers for private or religious schools, and supporting the goal of character building for good citizenship.

Meanwhile, the "politics of virtue" continued apace. Two weeks after my lecture, Michael Sandel's book, Democracy's Discontent, received high marks in the lead review of The New York Times Book Review. He was interviewed on C-Span's Booknotes by Brian Lamb and was a featured speaker at the third Conference on "Character Building in a Democratic, Civil Society" when it was held at the White House and Congress in early June. Sponsored by the Communitarian Network and Amitai Etzioni, conference speakers included Republican Senators Nancy Kassebaum and Alan Simpson and Democratic Senators Paul Simon and Joe Lieberman. As in the earlier conferences, civitas played a significant but fairly small role; moral character was featured over civic virtue. A fourth such conference is to be held in June 1997 again featuring a bipartisan program that includes political leaders from the White House, Congress, and major national education associations along with academic experts on character development, crime, and youth. As in the earlier conferences, one of the six task forces will deal with civic education in the schools, but the main emphasis is to be on "Character Building" as the title of the conference indicates.

The two faces of political virtue continued to appear throughout the campaign. On one hand, Garry Wills argued that the politics of mistrust had stooped so low that it was becoming actual contempt for government, and David Duke of the University of Virginia deplored the "politics of polarization." On the other front, a conservative trio (Jack Kemp, William Bennett, and Lamar Alexander) had formed "Empower America" to promote the devolution of federal education programs to the state, local, and private levels through the use of vouchers. To offset this view, the Gallup Poll of October 1996 showed that majority attitudes among the public actually favored strengthening public schools, opposing vouchers for nonpublic schools, rejecting privatization of public schools, and 86% saying that the most important goal of public education should be to prepare youth for responsible citizenship. Democrats were listening more carefully to such polls than were the Republicans.

In token of efforts to find bipartisan approaches to the problems of mistrust of government, a "National Commission on Civic Renewal" was formed with Senator Sam Nunn and William Bennett as co-chairs and Professor William Galston of the University of Maryland as executive director and with support from the Pew Charitable Trusts. Its goal was to do for citizenship what "A Nation at Risk" in 1983 had tried to do for educational reform, namely build civility and a civic spirit.

All these efforts at political civility had to compete, however, with recurring charges of ethical lapses at the White House over fund raising, FBI files, Whitewater, and Travelgate. But, also, the House Ethics Committee levelled charges against Speaker Newt Gingrich for conduct that did not reflect creditably on the House and for information given to the Committee that was "innacurate, incomplete, and unreliable." There was a special kind of irony in the case of Gingrich. The main charges had to do with his improper use of tax-exempt funds to support a college course on "Renewing American Civilization" for political purposes. Not exactly an example of "education for civitas" in the service of "civic virtue."

After President Clinton's second inaugural address in January 1997 stressing a "politics of reconciliation," hopes were expressed that "a third force" of moderation and agreement about the role of government might be in the offing. Examples: Statements by leaders of the Republican-leaning Heritage Foundation and of the Public Policy Institute of the Democratic Leadership Council.

It became even more clear in Clinton's State of the Union address that improvement of American education would be the chief goal of his administration. He listed ten points in this, his No.1 highest priority. The first point was to mount a national crusade for education standards, not Federal Government standards, but national standards defining what all American students must know, and to train teachers to lift the sights of students so that the students would be able pass national tests in the non-controversial subjects of reading by the 4th grade and of mathematics by the 8th grade. Nothing was said about standards or tests in the other core subjects. At this point, this omission was probably smart as a political tactic.

But, remember, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) had already agreed to issue a national test in civics and government in 1998, based on The National Standards for Civics and Government issued by the Center for Civic Education. Two more of Clinton's ten points could be crucial here: (1) The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (originally sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation) was cited as a model way to improve the preparation of teachers at a high level and should receive federal funds to aid its work. Much will depend on the kind of assessment the Board will develop for selecting master teachers in civics and government. (2) Character education must be taught to prepare children to be good citizens. But there is a major catch here. There was no mention of federal funds for this purpose. A national assessment of "good moral character" could become a most controversial matter. Instead, since assessment of the knowledge and skills of "good citizenship" is already in the making, I believe that is the way to go.

In general, it can be said that in the year since I delivered my lecture, the Democrats maintained their support for public education but moved toward parental rights by supporting parental choice among public schools and by expanding their support for charter schools. Whether large numbers of Democrats would begin to support vouchers for inner city scholarships for poor children remained to be seen. Polls in Milwaukee and elsewhere had already begun to show that inner city African-Americans were favoring choice programs that helped them to escape from deteriorating public schools.

In general, Republicans made much of parental rights and of reducing the federal financial role in education, but some frankly desired to move as much as politically possible toward a full free market for private and religious efforts in education, often supported by federal and state funds in the form of charter schools and vouchers for private and religious schools.

The Free Market Approach to Educational Reform

Parental Rights

A New York Times editorial on May 5th, 1996 (three days after my Minnesota lecture) strongly condemned the Christian Coalition's seemingly innocuous campaign to establish in law "parental rights" in education free from any outside interference. Headed "Parental Rights and Wrongs" the editorial argued that the real agenda of many supporters is to block schools from carrying out reasonable sex education programs and the teaching of evolution or even certain works of literature by Mark Twain and Shakespeare. They also wish to blunt the movement to grant children rights of their own. Enshrining a new set of "rights for parents will only create mischief in service of a shortsighted political agenda," said the Times.

In the June issue of "Church and State" published by Americans United for the Separation of Church and State, an article by Rob Boston described the efforts of a three-year old advocacy group based in Arlington, Virginia called "Of The People" as the nerve center for the parental rights movement. He went so far as to say that the parental rights movement is luring Americans into an attack on public schools and church-state separation and thus to extend the use of public vouchers in support of parental choice of private and religious schools.

Special efforts to pass a parental rights law on a ballot initiative were made in Colorado during the 1996 November election. It would have added a section to the State Constitution's Bill of Rights: Parents would have the inalienable "right to direct and control the upbringing, education, values and discipline of their children." Amendment 17 was funded overwhelmingly by the out-of-state Of The People and supported by the Christian Coalition and several other conservative activist groups, including Bob Dole during his presidential campaign. But it was opposed by Colorado's Democratic Governor Roy Romer and a broad coalition of 150 groups of teachers, churches, district attorneys, county sheriffs, nurses, and librarians as well as such national advocacy groups for public education as Americans United and People for the American Way.

The day before the election was held, the New York Times reporter, James Brooke, called the amendment campaign "the most polarizing initiative that the state has seen since 1992, when voters narrowly approved an amendment against gay rights that has since been declared unconstitutional." Although opinion polls had indicated passage of the initiative, it was defeated by 57% of the voters. The losers confidently predicted that they would win on another day and in many other places. There was little doubt that the parental rights campaign was indelibly linked with vouchers, enabling parents to put into educational practice their alleged legally and politically established rights.

Vouchers and School Choice

The debate over vouchers in the months before and after the 1996 election took several forms. The constitutional question regarding aid to religious schools was still being bruited in the courts. Wisconsin was an especially interesting example. A private school voucher plan for low-income families has been in place in Milwaukee since 1990, but it was limited to non-sectarian private schools until Republican Governor Tommy Thompson persuaded the state legislature in 1995 to expand the program to include sectarian religious schools as well as secular private schools. The case was taken directly to the Wisconsin State Supreme Court and argued by Kenneth Starr, the independent counsel who was also investigating the politically dynamite Whitewater case. However, this effort to bypass a local court, which was deemed unfriendly to the idea, backfired. In March 1996, the state Supreme Court split 3-3 on whether this move violated the state and federal constitutions and sent the case back to the lower court.

In July, Senator Dole went to Milwaukee and Cleveland to campaign for the expansion of school choice to religious schools, which might gain him more Catholic and labor votes as well as those of the Christian Coalition. He proposed a \$5-billion-a-year federal program to be

matched by as many as 15 states for pilot projects that would allow parents to pay tuition for whatever school the parents chose, public, private, or parochial. Dole called his vouchers "Opportunity Scholarships for Children" patterned after the GI Bill grants for World War II veterans. This argument prompted the Christian Science Monitor in an editorial on July 23rd to oppose vouchers for religious schools, but it did agree with Clinton's position on the church-state issue in what appeared to be his concession that vouchers for secular private schools might be tried in pilot projects. While the Wisconsin judge was about to consider the Milwaukee case, an Ohio state judge ruled in August 1996 that a similar program in Cleveland did not violate the First Amendment, because the vouchers benefited the religious schools only indirectly as a result of parental choice. This gave great hope to conservative advocates of choice.

The choice issue was in the forefront of the presidential debate between Dole and Clinton on October 6. In response to Dole's support for "opportunity scholarships," Clinton seemed to give in to the idea of vouchers for religious schools, when he said that he favored choice for public schools but added, "If we're going to have a private voucher plan, that ought to be done at the local level or the state level."

Once again, the President supported expansion of choice as a means of reform, but he did not touch the hot button issue of choice for private or religious schools. In fact, he generally avoided the constitutional issues of the separation of church and state, which lie at the root of controversies over vouchers for private schooling and over the expansion of charter schools to include religious school charters.

In the Wall Street Journal on October 10, Chester Finn immediately declared "The End of the Debate on School Choice." He gloated that "Mr. Clinton offered no principled argument against school vouchers....The argument over philosophy is over...and choice proponents have won." Finn's claim to victory was short lived, however. Secretary of Education Richard Riley and the White House backed away from the idea that vouchers for religious schools is what the President meant. In later comments, President Clinton reverted to his support for "choice in public schools," but during the election campaign he never seemed to accent the word public, nor did he elaborate the constitutional argument against support for religious schools.

After the election was over, vouchers for religious schools did take a beating at the state level. Washington State voters defeated a school choice initiative for the fourth time and by a hefty two-thirds majority. The defeated backers declared openly what may become a wider political tactic; they announced that at the next election they would propose a charter school law as a more viable political road to choice. Then, in January 1997, Wisconsin Judge Paul Higgenbotham struck down Governor Thompson's 1995 law, ruling that the expansion of that law offering vouchers for religious school attendance violated both the Wisconsin State Constitution and the U.S. Constitution. He also struck down the expansion of the program to include nonsectarian private schools. His ruling brought to the surface the principle that vouchers for religious schools violate the constitutional separation of church and state. His ruling insured that the case would go back up to the Wisconsin State Supreme Court and very likely on to the U.S. Supreme Court. The First Amendment religious question continued to be of concern to a large number of mainline churches as well as to more fundamentalist religious conservatives who worried that aid to religious schools would lead to unwanted government intervention.

Meanwhile, some political conservatives began to shift their arguments to a different tack that might prove to be more easily palatable to the courts and to public opinion, i.e., provide public vouchers for poor children in inner cities who could not otherwise escape their dreadful public schools.

Whether the House weekend retreat on civility, which 200 House Republicans and Democrats held together in early March 1997 at Hershey, Pennsylvania, will have much effect on political discourse may be tested when Congress comes to debate what Majority Leader Trent Lott designated as Senate bill No. 1 of this Congress, called the "Safe and Affordable Schools Act of 1997." It provides \$50 million in the first year for 20-30 school districts to distribute "certificates" to enable children in "unsafe" inner cities to attend private schools.

And in the House, Republican Representatives J. C. Watts and James M. Talent introduced an omnibus bill called the "American Community Renewal Act" aimed at inner cities, which includes \$5 billion for school vouchers and federal funds for social services conducted by sectarian religious institutions. In mid-March, 1997 Floyd H. Flake, a Democratic Representative from New York who is a member of the Black Caucus in the House, announced his support for this inner city bill, thus breaking the traditional party line-up on vouchers and possibly forecasting that this particular approach may become an important breach in the wall against vouchers.

Another tack may be indicated by a Wall Street Journal editorial welcoming the values of a private experiment in which "School Choice Scholarships" are funded by philanthropic money from business corporations rather than by public tax funds, enabling poor students in the inner cities to attend religious schools of any denomination as well as to nonsectarian private schools. This could be another approach to vouchers, free of constitutional barriers, in the effort to prove that private schools are superior to union-dominated public schools. The general idea of private funds for private schools carries no constitutional barrier as far as financing is concerned. A problem still remains with regard to the role of the state and local communities in defining national standards for those schools and in determining the curriculum and instruction designed to prepare for American citizenship. A similar problem confronts the spread of charter schools.

Charter Schools

In my Minnesota lecture I did not give many details about charter schools, and I cannot do so in this Afterword. But it is very clear that the charter school movement has gained considerable strength since March of 1996, and the volume of controversy, rhetoric, and writing about it has exploded. Attitudes toward the idea and practice of charter schools vary from untrammelled enthusiasm to great scepticism and opposition. By and large, the "liberal educational establishment of public education" has been most sceptical and the "conservative free market reformers" have been the most outspoken promoters.

Still, the National Education Association and American Federation of Teachers have moved rather slowly and haltingly from opposition or scepticism to more or less willingness to try some pilot projects involving charter school practices. Naturally, they are less willing to give charter schools the option to hire uncertified teachers, excessive freedom from legal and civil rights regulations, or public scrutiny of their fiscal affairs. At the opposite extreme, the Educational Excellence Network headed by Chester E. Finn, Jr. and Diane Ravitch has constantly trumpeted the values of the charter school movement. From its beginning, its monthly "Network News and Views" has been filled with reports and articles under the heading "Chartering the Course." Its volumes have been a prime source of reporting research studies and favorable editorial opinion during most of its publication life, which ended with its December 1996 issue.

Indeed, one of the more sceptical articles, originally published in the International Journal of Educational Reform (April 1996) was reprinted in "Network News" in August 1996. Louann Bierlein and Mark Bateman of Louisiana State University were doubtful that charter schools could succeed in the face of opposition by the status quo. On the other hand, two of the most enthusiastic supporters have been Chester Finn, fellow at the conservative Hudson Institute, and Joe Nathan, director of the Center for School Change at the University of Minnesota's Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs.

In a featured Op-Ed piece in the New York Times (August 24, 1996) Finn exuberantly claimed that charter schools are now "the most vibrant force in American education." He pointed out that both Senator Dole and President Clinton had spoken out in their favor, and that 25 states have now passed legislation authorizing charter schools. He reported briefly on a new study that he and his colleagues had made of 43 charter schools in seven states: The best of these have had the most independence to decide what to teach, how to teach it, whom to hire, how to use resources, what hours to operate, and how best to meet student needs. But he cautioned that teachers unions may spoil them with insistence upon collective bargaining and tenure rights for teachers. Finn pointed out that of the 8,400 students in their sample of charter schools 63% were minorities and 55% were poor. He admitted that "We don't know for certain that charter students are learning more" because the schools are too new, but he was certain that "by redefining what public education means, they offer a model of accountability that traditional schools will find hard to avoid."

By September 1996 both the NEA and AFT were encouraging their local chapters to experiment with charter schools in the hopes of demonstrating that favorable results could be achieved by charter schools even though they maintained their teachers union contracts. The momentum toward charter schools not only continued to be highlighted in the "News and Notes" of the Excellence Network but was also featured in the September 1996 issue of the Phi Delta Kappan, which featured ten articles mostly favorable to the charter school movement. Joe Nathan, as guest editor of the Special Section on Charter Schools, gave a brief history of the five years of the charter movement and cited four powerful concepts that have empowered it: "freedom and choice for parents, entrepreneurial opportunities for educators, explicit accountability for schools, and thoughtful, fair competition for public school districts." Apparently sensitive to the character of the Kappan readership, Nathan stressed the values of charter schools for reform of public schools and distinguished it clearly from the voucher movement. His book on charter schools was published by Jossey-Bass in October 1996; it formed the basis of his article in Education Week (February 19, 1997). He applauded the added support given to charter schools by President Clinton's endorsement as well as that of Secretary Riley and such educational reformers as Robert Slavin, James P. Comer, Henry Levin, and Deborah Myer. And he took pains to stress the "public school" character of the charter schools, especially if they are freed from supervision by local school districts and freed from regulations by state and federal governments.

This is an interesting argument to be made by those who claim that "local control of education" is better than federal or state control. Apparently, the more "local" the control is, the better for educational achievement. "Local" thus comes down to a group of like-minded parents or even to the locality of a single family engaged in "home schooling." With the abolition of federal, state, or local district controls, the ultimate test thus is "accountability" for the achievement of students. And who will set the standards and who will measure or test the level of achievement? Will "standards of achievement" also be set by individual schools, or teachers, or parents? If charter school teachers and parents do not like "national standards" in history or English, where will they turn? Will they still be subject to state tests of achievement in order to maintain their charters? If left to themselves, will there be any standards for the qualifications or licensing of teachers or of "home school" parents who do the teaching?

These are questions that need to be faced as the charter school movement gains momentum. The Indiana Policy Center in its "Policy News and Notes" (Winter 1996-97) pointed out that the number of charter schools had doubled in the past year, from 226 to 480, and that federal funding for charter schools had increased from \$6 million in 1995 to \$51 million in 1997. That was an interesting development on behalf of those who wish to decrease the federal role in education and turn it back to local and parental control.

In sum, while there has been rapid spread and approval of the charter school idea, I found no parallel increase of interest among charter school advocates in assuring that the schools run by parents, teachers, or private interest groups were expanding their interest in assuring a lively and fruitful education for the public good and the other values of a democratic civitas. Whatever the fault of public schools, their main justification and rationale have been their foundational contribution to civic education for all students. I do not find such a rationale in the ideology of charter school advocates, let alone in the growing number of research studies focussed on their value in raising the achievement levels of charter school students. So, it becomes more necessary than ever that the civic education of charter schools be evaluated in terms of their acceptance of the National Standards for Civics and Government and their willingness to have their students measured by the NAEP tests of achievement in civics and government, which will be ready for use in 1998.

If, however, charter schools object to such testing on the grounds that their very rationale is to be free of such outside "accountability," and to develop a curriculum that suits the needs of the children whose parents chose the particular charter school, what then shall be the reply of the state or local educational authorities that issued their charters? I believe that it must be that education for citizenship is the obligation of all schools in America, public, private, or religious, and that "certain studies plainly essential to good citizenship must be taught." Whatever the other merits of charter schools may be, merits that entitle them to be considered as "public schools," or as substitutes for public schools, they must be held to account for their teaching of good citizenship as a prime goal of their charters. If there are to be national tests of achievement in English literacy and in mathematics applicable to students in all of American schools, there must also be national tests of achievement in civics and government.

In the most recent article to be cited in this Working Paper, Chester Finn and his colleagues at the Hudson Institute's Washington office even seem to be worried that charter schools will become too popular in the hands of "The False Friends of Charter Schools." (Education Week Commentary, May 1, 1997). They are fearful that President Clinton's adoption of the charter school idea and his proposal to increase federal funds for their start-up from \$50 million to \$100 million will dilute the basic purpose of breaking free from government regulations and educational bureaucrats. At least, they gave a kind of answer, if not reassurance, to sceptics. They not only say that "the school must be free to decide who will teach what and how," but they say a little later:

...since the charter-issuing body is not obliged to renew its charter, to remain in existence it [the school] must deliver the promised results, usually defined in academic standards and tracked on statewide (or other) tests. If the charter issuer wants to ensure that the school doesn't voyage into curricular outer space, it can stipulate core skills and knowledge. Otherwise, those running the school decide what to teach. (The one big exception, of course, is religion.)

But what they give on one hand is taken back by saying "Public education, as currently constituted, is a species showing signs of extinction." As Checker would say, "Stay tuned."

Privatization of Public Schools

In the past year, much more public attention has been devoted to the spread of charter schools than to the efforts of private enterprisers to create "new designs" for public schools or, by contract, to take over some or all of the management of public schools in a particular district and still earn a profit for the enterprise. Every now and then the press has reported that a study has been made of such efforts and the result publicized. For example, the Rand Corporation made a study of the new design projects being worked up by the New American Schools Development Corporation since its establishment by private corporations in 1991 during the Bush administration. The headline in Education Week (May 1, 1996) said "Progress Report on NASDC Projects Finds Mixed Results." I have not been able to study the report in

detail, but the story in Education Week played up some of the barriers that impede reform, such as not working closely enough with teachers colleges to prepare teachers for the role they must play in curriculum development and not involving the public in discussions of the goals of schooling and the value of education.

Later in May, a progress report on the Edison project's "new designs" for public elementary schools stated that they were receiving "high marks" from the four communities in which they were operating. Plans were made to expand to twelve schools, including four middle schools, in 1996-97. This turned out to be a small scale enterprise compared to the original vision of thousands of such schools to lead the way for the improvement of education in the United States. None of the press reports I have seen about these schools indicate a special concern for civic education, while much is made of a longer school day, expansive technology for all children, cleaner buildings, and more individualized instruction.

Meanwhile, other private contracts with public schools met with great difficulties and were broken off or not renewed. The most adverse publicity was given to the disputes that arose over the efforts of Education Alternatives, Inc to run the schools in Baltimore and Hartford. In almost all cases of ongoing experimentation, it was declared that it was too soon to be able to verify that test scores of student achievement had been improved by the privatizing efforts, let alone making valid comparisons with "regular" public schools that are endowed with similar physical and personnel conditions. Nevertheless, AEI was teaming up with developers in the Phoenix area to build and run charter schools in new suburban developments. (Education Week, April 16, 1997).

Perhaps the largest and by common consent the most praiseworthy of recent joint educational reform projects is exemplified in the nearly 1,000 schools that are affiliated with the Coalition of Essential Schools, created and run by TheodoreSizer in his headquarters at Brown University. I cannot make judgments about the attention that those schools give to civic education, but I do not find specific mention of a civic purpose in the Nine Common Principles which have guided the Coalition since its beginning in 1984, beyond "promoting trust and decency." Nor indeed do I find the civic mission of education prominent in the Annenberg Institute of School Reform which Sizer also heads. The emphasis on evaluation to be demonstrated by student "exhibitions" rather than by tests may mean that coalition schools are reluctant to engage in the movement for national standards and national assessment. Sizer himself has long been on record as severely criticizing any national tests beyond reading, writing, and basic mathematics, although he admits that local community service can be a valuable element in the curriculum.

What may be more troubling than the projects that do not specifically try to improve civic education is the growing number of voices that are giving up on the fundamental idea of public education and turning to the private sector to "save" American education from government itself. Chester Finn's incisive writings sometimes carry this sting. In an article in Commentary (September 1996) entitled "Can the Schools Be Saved?" Finn reminds us of the original impulses leading to public schools in the United States and that "the principle of public education runs deep in our society."

But he also reminds us of some of the attempts to reform and revitalize American education through vouchers and privatization in which he himself believes. And then he goes on to say that "public education ought not mean government-run schools. Society's obligation is to see that instruction is provided and that learning occurs. It is not to operate a bureaucratic system of uniform institutions staffed by government employees....Ending the present monopoly of the bureaucrats and the unions would liberate thousands of capable educators to break with the orthodoxies of their profession and create schools that parents might actually want their children to attend." Somehow, Finn argues that this freedom would transmit the sense of a

common civic culture more effectively than would reform of the curriculum and of teacher education along the lines of the National Standards of Civics and Government. He seems to think that "a panel of respected civic, business, and intellectual leaders, *privately* constituted" could frame a core curriculum of national unity better than "academic experts" could do. However, Finn does believe in the efficacy of national examinations and, as a member of the governing board of NAEP, he eventually agreed to the structuring of the 1998 NAEP test of civics and government on the basis of the national civics standards, which indeed was drawn up by privately constituted panels.

While Finn and other conservatives were touting the values of privatization, some liberals were arguing against privatization as a genuine threat to public education. For example, the Twentieth Century Fund published a research study by three New York University professors entitled "Hard Lessons: Public Schools and Privatization" in October 1996. They found that the highly publicized efforts of private groups to manage public schools had not raised student achievement, lowered costs, or resulted in more equal opportunity for underprivileged families. The Edison project was not included in the study because such data were not available. The report was sharply criticized by Finn, Denis Doyle, and other conservatives who charged that its conclusions were predictable because of the political leanings of the authors.

While the debates continued for and against privatization and the research results were at least mixed, the debate was sure to continue. Soon after the Twentieth Century Fund report was announced, the Edison project received another \$30 million, bringing its total investment to \$100 million and assuring a continuation of the experimentation with the dozen elementary and secondary schools it was operating during its second year of operation. I do not have first hand acquaintance with the Edison schools, but I do note that one of its earlier designs gave considerable attention to history and civics and the social sciences, including lectures on the Constitution by Benno Schmidt, the Edison director and former president of Yale.

As the year 1996 came to a close, a new organization gained considerable publicity through a C-SPAN program featuring its conference in Arlington, Virginia on December 24, 1996. The name of the organization, whose headquarters are in Fresno, California, makes its mission quite clear: the Separation of School and State Alliance. The government must be kept out of education, and the state education system of public schools should be broken up and placed in private hands. The speakers reflected a conservative and religious alliance that found public schools dominated by liberal and statist elites and by labor unions whose goal is to get the most money for the least work; they have taken values out of the schools. Goals 2000 is a federal attempt to wipe out diversity and religious values; its national standards and assessment goals must be resisted with the motto: "Government is not God."

And, from a rather unexpected quarter, the Educational Forum of Kappa Delta Pi (Winter 1997) carried a series of articles that seemed to praise efforts to undermine the historic value of universal public education in common schools. An article entitled "Black-Flight Academies: The New Christian Day Schools" concludes:

...black evangelicals of the 1980s and 1990s are reconsidering their historic commitment to public education...to establish and support schools they believe will meet the academic and spiritual needs of African-American children....Clearly, the growth of these schools testifies to a robust, conservative Christianity in the African-American community and a profound disillusionment with public education. It remains to be seen whether autonomous, faith-driven black-flight academies are transitory or will become permanent features of the U.S. educational landscape.

Another "escape" from the historical system of public education was the Kappan article entitled "Compulsory School Attendance: An Idea Past Its Prime?" in which Barry McGhan

argues that the logical conclusion of the choice movement is that

"The era of U.S. compulsory education is perhaps coming to an end....Compulsory school attendance is a 19th century idea that has apparently outlived its usefulness....Public schools play an essential role in...providing students the educational foundation for the preservation and development of constitutional government and democracy....Eliminating compulsory attendance will help preserve public education for future generations and eliminate the need for the most divisive proposal for school choice—public vouchers for private schools - because safety and order will be available in every public school, which would essentially become a magnet or charter school....Making K-12 public school attendance voluntary will truly make education a matter of choice."

And what will happen if parents happen to choose schools that do not think that teaching for civitas is important, but prefer a school that concentrates instead on teaching the best way to reach the "Gates of Heaven" or to gain sovereign independence for the Republic of Texas?

The Urgency of National Standards for Civitas Education

So I return in the finale of this Afterword to reemphasize the urgency of agreeing upon national standards in education for civitas, standards which can provide a common framework for study in civic education by all students in all American schools whether they be compulsory-public, voluntary-public, charter-public, secular-private, religious-private, or whatever combination the political process may produce in the states and the nation in coming years. I urge the reader to look again at pages 35 ff. in my Minnesota paper dealing with the urgency of national standards in civics and government. In the year following that lecture, the standards movement in general gained some momentum in the states and lost some momentum at the national level.

The "Education Summit," which was held in March 1996 at Palisades, N.Y., called by the state governors and by business interests, reaffirmed its support for high academic standards, but insisted that they be drawn up at the state and local levels, thus departing from the earlier summits that had stressed the importance of common standards throughout the country. Instead of a bipartisan national council to approve state standards as they were drawn up as provided in Goals 2000, the summit agreed to establish a non-governmental clearinghouse to spread information and assist the states in their efforts. This clearly meant that academic standards are the business of states and localities, not the federal government.

The business and governors' summit forecast the budget agreements that were worked out in the appropriations bill passed by Congress and signed by the President at the end of April 1996. The bill deleted several controversial ingredients of the Clinton administration's Goals 2000 plan which had been attacked by conservative Republicans. It eliminated the proposed National Education Standards and Improvement Council and removed the provision that set requirements for what states must include in their school improvement plans when they are submitted to the Secretary of Education asking for federal funds to promote high standards. And it included a "parental rights" provision that Goals 2000 will "not require or permit any state or federal official to inspect a home, judge how parents raise their children, or remove children from their parents."

"The Politics of Standards"

The academic and professional community as well as the political community was often split over the advisability of national standards. For example, the pages of the educational and public press resounded with the "Politics of Standards" as proclaimed in a special report of Education Week (June 5, 1996). The lead article was written by Mararet Branson, associate director of the Center for Civic Education, who urged the states to adopt truly national standards like those for civics and government, which were already widely influential in many

other countries. A similar theme was sounded by Democratic Governor Roy Romer of Colorado, who had been a robust leader in the standards movement. Diane Ravitch criticized the move to put "the states in the driver's seat on standards" because "We are one nation, not 50. It is naive to believe that each state should have markedly different standards in science, mathematics, English, and other important studies." I'm only sorry that Diane did not also specifically mention the civics standards as one of the "other important studies," inasmuch as she had helped to fund them when she was in the Department of Education and had praised them in person when they were unveiled at the Supreme Court in 1994.

In the same issue, a conservative from the Family Research Council opposed standards of all kinds as "an exercise in government-approved truth" that intrudes upon the rights of parents. As the Education Week editor of this Commentary panel put it, Robert G. Morrison's view argued that "parents need not look past their own backyard for direction." Interestingly, the split that exists among professional educators was quickly revealed when Nel Noddings, an influential professor of child education at Stanford, fired off a critical letter to Education Week (June 19, 1996) in which she argued that national standards are not fair when they expect "poor kids [to] meet the same standards as the well-to-do." After all, it is in the local classroom where decisions will be made: "...[E]xactly what will be done with those topics [of a set of standards] must be determined by teachers and students working together toward mutually constructed and accepted objectives."

The range of views about standards, especially as handled by the Palisades summit, was further illustrated in the June 1996 issue of the Excellence Network's "News and Views," which contained a dozen articles most of which approved the idea of national standards. But the conservative attack on the U.S. History Standards was reaffirmed by Lynn Cheney who still did not like the revised version now approved by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. and Diane Ravitch. And the Governor of Pennsylvania, Tom Ridge, argued that national standards to be judged by their ability to fit into a restructured "consumer-oriented system" of public schools that honors charter schools, school choice, and loosening the hold of teachers unions on the schools.

Meanwhile, the U.S. Department of Education's Community Update for June 1996 continued to be upbeat in its biennial report about the way Goals 2000 were spreading, at least in part because the Secretary had "the authority to waive many federal rules and regulations if they interfered with local or state education reform strategies." This loosening of rules forecast a growing tendency among states to ask for federal funds largely to buy computers and upgrade technological effectiveness of schools without any special attention to the original purpose of Goals 2000, which was to aid states in upgrading academic achievement of all children in important core studies of the curriculum symbolized above all in the adoption of national standards.

By August 1996 two surveys, approaching standards from quite different political points of view, indicated that standards were making mixed headway among the states. The American Federation of Teachers issued a report drawn up by Mathew Gandal, senior associate in AFT's educational issues department, which found that only 15 states were developing standards which AFT deemed to be of passing grade for clarity, specificity, and sufficiently grounded in scholarly content in all four of the core subjects of English, math, science, and history. It was found that all states ((excepting Iowa and Wyoming) and the District of Columbia claimed to be at work on standards, but only eight states had achieved exemplary standards requiring a rigorous curriculum in one or more of the four subjects. Only Virginia received honors in all four subjects.

Of particular interest here, the AFT report points out that the controversies over the early national standards in history and English had apparently held back development of strong state standards in those subjects. In commenting on this report in his Sunday column in the New

York Times (Sept. 29, 1996), Al Shanker also cited a new book by E. D. Hirsch entitled The Schools We Need agreeing fully that all children should be guaranteed a chance to study the same high-quality curriculum that gives them the knowledge they will need to participate and prosper in American society. Shanker agreed with Hirsch that such access is "a civil rights issue."

In August 1996, Chester Finn and Diane Ravitch issued a report from the Educational Excellence Network to its Education Policy Committee and the American people on the general status of "Education Reform 1995-1996." Their chapter on standards was entitled "Much Talk, Not Much Action." So they could give standards only a B-minus which meant they were on the low side of "Good Work." They were pleased that the Palisades summit was dominated by business and the state governors in contrast to the Charlottesville summit led by President Bush, although they admitted that President Clinton "delivered an excellent address to the summit-goers." They found that the efforts of the states were uneven at best, but that leaving standards to 15,000 local school districts or 110,000 public and private schools would be worse.

However, Finn and Ravitch agreed that the states should be the proper focus of the activity, even though there should not be an "Ohio English, Oregon math, or Vermont science. Further, looking at what states have produced to date, we find a motley collection, uneven in quality and rigor....In most states the standards are typically vague, overly broad, and undemanding." In their discussion of the eight subject fields in which national standards have been finished, they confined their remarks to the four that were finished in 1995-1996, calling them a mixed bag. They mentioned science ("some solid academic standards"), English ("a travesty"), foreign language ("a fair level of clarity"), and the revised U.S. history ("defensible").

I was disappointed that Finn and Ravitch could not bring themselves to mention approvingly the civics and government standards issued in 1994, which both had praised more than faintly on other occasions. They represent a strong contingent of conservative educational and political leaders who could, if they only would, argue that common civic values should be studied as part of the core studies in school on a level with English, science, math, and history and that therefore there should be "no Montant civics and no Texas government."

Such support could span much of the political spectrum inasmuch as Al Shanker remained until his death on February 22, 1997 a strong advocate of the civics and government standards. Shanker was a member of the National Review Committee of the civics standards and, earlier, he had been a member of the National Review Council of CIVITAS, chaired by Ernest Boyer. Shanker came to our meetings to review and criticize both volumes, and he always took an active part. It was most significant to have this consensus about the value of the civics standards from leaders who were basically political adversaries and who differed radically about the values of public education and the threats to public education from vouchers, parental choice, and privatization.

In his final column on March 2, 1997, "Where We Stand," a column which had appeared in the Sunday New York Times for 25 years, Shanker's autobiographical statement of 1990 is quoted as follows:

I believe that public education is the glue that has held this country together. Critics now say that the common school never really existed, that it's time to abandon this ideal in favor of schools that are designed to appeal to groups based on ethnicity, race, religion, class, or common interests of various kinds. But schools like these would foster divisions in our society; they would be like setting a time bomb....Public schools played a big role in holding our nation together. They brought together children of different races, languages, religions, and cultures and gave them a common language and a sense of common purpose....I

know that keeping public education together is worth whatever effort it takes.

Such a view demonstrates where the purposes of civic education and of public education coincide. It is a view that the advocates of choice, vouchers, privatization, charter schools and parental rights must come to terms with. The very least they can do is to accept, nay insist, that private and religious schools do at least as well as public schools in preparing their students for the rights and responsibilities of democratic citizenship as set forth in CIVITAS and in the National Standards for Civics and Government. It is fine for conservatives like Finn and Ravitch to be in favor of national standards, but it is difficult to see how standards can be achieved if public education is weakened in the process or if states are not somehow moving in a similar direction. Sending federal dollars to Alabama under the Goals 2000 program and allowing the state to use the money simply to strengthen its technology in the schools, as was approved in September 1996, does not necessarily promote education for civitas, or any other subject field for that matter.

One way to provide some continuity across state lines was envisioned at the Palisades summit of governors and business officers in March 1996, namely to establish a nonprofit, nonpartisan, nongovernmental "entity" called Achieve to act as a clearinghouse of information so that states can compare what progress they are making. Achieve was a political compromise. As of April 1997, a director for Achieve had still not been announced, but co-chairmen Governor Tommy Thompson of Wisconsin and Louis V. Gerstner, CEO of IBM, announced that a director would soon be named and the entity up and running. It was a political compromise to replace the National Education Standards and Improvement Council that had been part of the Goals 2000 Act. It was to be "national" but to have no "Federal" role or power to enforce or mandate anything. As Peter Applebome of the New York Times (December 8, 1996) put it, the nation is divided by the need to develop higher educational performance by meeting higher standards but which is opposed by the history of faith in education as a local enterprise: "What emerges is an odd dance of trying to establish guides that would lift national achievement without ceding an iota of local control." The year's delay in launching Achieve seemed to indicate that private, corporate, and state action sometimes can be no more efficient than the Federal Government itself.

Throughout the fall of 1996 the debates over standards continued to be featured in the public and professional press. For example, Sara Mosle, a contributing writer for the New York Times Magazine, argued in the Magazine (October 27, 1996):

Education is a campaign issue without a focus. The school reform that really matters is not vouchers or charter schools or breaking the unions or wiring the classrooms. It's a curriculum set in Washington, and monitored in every town and city through testing....Resistance to testing comes from both liberal and conservative quarters. Progressive educators worry that a national curriculum would lead to more rote exercises, unimaginative teaching, and a greater reliance on standardized tests, which they see as biased against poor and minority-group children. And conservatives, who you might think would cozy up to standards, are deeply suspicious of any sort of outside meddling in their neighborhood schools. Several districts, for instance, have turned down federal funds offered under Goals 2000 rather than cede any perceived control of their schools to the Federal Government.

Mosle comes down on the side of national standards, citing conservatives Diane Ravitch and C. D. Hirsch as well as liberal Al Shanker as the leading advocates of standards. She insightfully points out that "Standards advocates like Shanker have essentially offered a trade-off with more progressive-minded educators: standards for charter schools. It's a deal that those on both the left and right can accept." She also had it right when she says that "Choice makes no sense without standards."

As the year 1996 ended, the question about what to do about national standards continued to be debated from all quarters of the political spectrum. In her valedictory article in the final issue of Network News and Views, Diane Ravitch was proudest of the work it and the Excellence Network had done on behalf of national standards and praised William Galston, President Clinton's domestic adviser during his first term, for advocating rigorous academic standards and examinations with high stakes attached. And at the beginning of the new year, standards emerged front and center on the political as well as the educational scene.

In mid-January 1997, Education Week issued a first-ever report entitled "Quality Counts: A Report Card on the Condition of Public Education in the 50 States." It compared and rated all states on 75 different indicators lumped into four categories, the first of which was "Standards and Assessments." Standards are being discussed in every state and the work in this area seems to be paying off. It is the one in which the states over-all earned their highest average grade - a B. Twenty-two states earned an A, thirteen a B, seven a C, two a D. Two states received F (Iowa and Wyoming) because they decided not to develop statewide standards and assessments. In generalizing, the report said:

Public education systems in the 50 states are riddled with excellence but rife with mediocrity. Despite 15 years of earnest efforts to improve public schools and raise student achievement, states haven't made much progress.

As the new millenium aproaches, there is growing concern that if public education doesn't soon improve, one of two outcomes is inevitable: Our democratic system and our economic strength, both of which depend on an educated citizenry, will steadily erode; or,

Alternative forms of education will emerge to replace public schools as we have known them.....Either would be a sad loss for America.

Echoing these sentiments and those of his own Inaugural Address, President Clinton spelled out his educational agenda in his State of the Union Address on February 4, 1997. He said education would be the top priority for his second administration. He listed ten points of which the very first was to promote national standards that designate what all students must know to succeed in the 21st century and to create voluntary new national tests of student achievement in reading at the 4th grade level and in math at the 8th grade level. The first round of testing would be held in 1999. By concentrating on the relatively non-controversial subjects of reading and mathematics and the use of tests that were already well respected in these fields, Clinton hoped to gain support from a wide spectrum of the public and of educators.

Not surprisingly, his proposals on standards received approval from Checker Finn, Diane Ravitch, and Republican Governor George Engler of Michigan as well as Democratic Governor Roy Romer of Colorado, the National Alliance of Business, and the Business Round Table. Conservatives were split, with opposition coming from the Eagle Forum's Phyllis Schlafly and FairTest. Liberal educators were not altogether happy, as witnessed by Professor Richard Wolf of Teachers College. But the heads of both teachers unions told the National Press Club that they supported higher standards for student achievement. And, surprising to many, was the report of a survey by Public Agenda which revealed that three-fourths of American teenagers readily admitted that they would work harder on their studies if they were required to meet higher academic standards as measured by rigorous tests.

At the end of April 1997, it was still too soon to judge how "national" the practice of creating and assessing national standards will become and how widely national or international tests will be used to assess achievement of the standards among the states and localities. President Clinton proposed that voluntary national tests be developed comparable to those of the highly regarded National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) to assess reading

achievement and those of the Third International Mathematical and Science Study (TIMSS) to assess mathematics achievement. However, the anti-Washington mood was still so strong that this was greeted by the warning that "it would be wrong for the White House or Congress to start mandating what those [national] standards should be." So said Republican Governor Tommy Thompson of Wisconsin in the New York Times on February 21, 1997:

"It should be up to the states and local school boards to decide what the students need to learn. Education is a local issue....Setting world-class standards for our schools will be successful only if it is done from the ground up - by parents, teachers, administrators, businesses, and local tax payers....So while the state [of Wisconsin] is developing a model set of standards, it is up to each school district to adopt that model, modify it or establish its own standards....Most of us agree that rigorous academic standards will help us improve our schools. It's best if the parents of Elroy, Wis. and other communities across America set those standards."

Governor Thompson's views reflected the views of a critical mass of state and local officials as well as conservative educators and states-rights citizens like John Silber, chairman of the Massachusetts Board of Education, and Edwin Delattre, dean of Boston University's School of Education. At a luncheon meeting of governors and business leaders at the National Press Club on March 27, Governor Thompson and Louis Gerstner reiterated the view that educational reform could be achieved from the ground up by states and localities. They praised the efforts of several governors since the summit of March 1996. One way to spread knowledge about these efforts is through the new web site now established by Achieve. It will enable the states and localities to learn about what other states and localities are doing about standards and assessments and to compare the quality so that states can compete scholastically as they do in other ways. Already 30 states are on the internet web and an executive director will soon be appointed.

In answer to questions, Governor Thompson praised the great leadership of Al Shanker of the AFT and said he was heartened by the recent views of Bob Chase, new president of the National Aeducation Association and would meet with him later that day. He also wished that controversies over national standards would cease and leave the matter to the states. Similarly, he was willing to leave the U.S. Department alone to do its work. Mr. Gerstner also argued that internet access would help the process of developing standards from the ground up. Standards will look alike if teachers will get with it. He also offered a provocative challenge to government and business: For every dollar spent on computers, we should spend a dollar on educating teachers. I hope he meant that the education of teachers should include more than simply how to run computers. This brings me to my final Afterword topic.

Educating Teachers for Civitas: "The Time Is Now"

On three occasions during 1993, the first year of the Clinton administration, I addressed the question of the role that education for civitas should play in the professional preparation of teachers. I must say that I was at that time rather optimistic that substantial gains could be made. In March, I gave a lecture at the dedication of the Wendell W. Wright Education Building at Indiana University-Bloomington entitled "The Great Task Remaining Before Us." Portions of the lecture were published in the November/December issue of The Journal of Teacher Education under the title "The Time Is Now: To Frame the Civic Foundations of Teacher Education." And the Fall issue of Educational Foundations carried "A Rejoinder" to the draft of a position paper prepared for the Committee on Academic Standards and Accreditation of the American Educational Studies Association by Professor Steve Tozer of the University of Illinois.

The underlying theme of these three papers was that the professional preparation of all teachers should include a core program of studies devoted to what I called the "civic

foundations of education." This civic core should be universally present, indeed required, in the liberal arts education and in the professional training of all prospective teachers. I argued that the civic foundations of education should accompany the other three elements usually required in high grade programs of teacher education, namely, substantial academic preparation in a major field of teaching, pedagogical knowledge and expertise in the ways students learn, and practical experience in the classroom under the tutelage of a master teacher. I argued that for a decade the major players in educational reform had paid little attention to teacher education for civitas; I cited the 1983 Excellence Commission and the Holmes Group of education deans in 1986.

Nor was the civic goal of teacher education highlighted in the initial policies and perspectives of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in 1989, even though Lee Shulman and Gary Sykes at Stanford had included in their report to the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy in May 1986 a category of assessment that would have embraced such a goal. One of the eight categories they proposed for assessment of what highly competent professional teachers need to know was called "Foundations of Professional Understanding" (including history and policy; philosophy and psychology; cultural and cross-cultural factors; professional ethics). I do not know what happened to this category, but the final categories did not seem to assess civic understanding among the best-qualified teachers of the nation.

The same story continued. The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), a project sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers, was initiated to develop a model set of standards for beginning teachers that will identify the "common core" of knowledge and skills that all new teachers should possess and to make the initial licensure requirements of the states compatible with the advanced certification principles of the National Board. Again, I did not notice any particular mention of the need for beginning teachers to know about the fundamental principles and values of constitutional democracy or about the basic civic mission of public education in preparing youth for citizenship.

I argued that the new licensing and certification goals being set by these new agencies could begin by adapting the volume CIVITAS as an excellent basis for such a civic foundations program. And I expressed the hope that the federal enactment of Goals 2000, then being prepared in both houses of Congress, would be favorable to such ideas. I said in my Indiana paper:

The prospect that national education goals will be embodied in federal law is truly a landmark in the history of American education. The time is therefore now for those in teacher education to make sure that our historic rhetoric from the time of Jefferson and Madison, extolling the role of public education in forming all American youth into good citizens, can be more fully realized than ever before.

My optimism was further heightened by the fact that civics and government had been added to the list of "challenging subject matter" courses of core studies in the Goals 2000 legislation to improve K-12 education. The prospective legislation also included federal funds to the states for "the improvement of preservice teacher education and school administrator programs" so that they will equip educators with the subject matter and pedagogical expertise necessary for preparing their students to meet challenging standards. And Congress did in fact add "Teacher Education and Professional Development" as a seventh national education goal.

I believed that if teacher education were embedded in our national education goals, this too would mark a genuinely new chapter in the history of American education. It would mean that teacher training programs (both pre-service and in-service) should be geared to the subject matter areas for which national standards of achievement for students were being developed. As John F. Jennings put it in the Kappan (December 1992): "It makes no sense to have

agreement on what students should know and be able to do in these various areas unless teachers are trained in this content." And if the components of teacher education are limited to (1) competence in the subject matter of a particular major field, (2) psychological knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching and learning, and (3) supervised practical and clinical experience in the classroom, it is likely that the citizenship goal will be passed over in the federal initiatives for national education reform as it has been in most of the educational movements by professional and state agencies since 1983.

I would define the "civic foundations of education" as that aspect of teacher education which prepares all teachers to play their civic and vocational roles as professional decision-makers in an educational system devoted to strengthening a democratic society. (For elaboration, see "The Time Is Now: To Frame the Civic Foundations of Teacher Education" in the Journal of Teacher Education, November/December 1993.)

The civic foundations of education should take seriously and explicitly the historic argument that the primary reason for establishing and maintaining universal education in the American Republic is to develop among all students, whether in public or private schools, the knowledge, sentiments, virtues, and skills of democratic citizenship. This surely includes a reasoned commitment to the fundamental values and principles of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights as well as an understanding of the issues and controversies that still confront educators today. Teacher education programs should enable all members of the teaching profession to develop a coherent intellectual and moral framework of the meaning of democratic citizenship from which to view the role they should play as professional educators in American democratic society. This task was the original purpose of the "Foundations of Education," as first developed at Teachers College, Columbia University during the 1930s to the 1950s and carried on by the American Educational Studies Association and by twenty professional education associations collectively organized in the Council of Learned Societies in Education, now a constituent member of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

The fundamental character of a profession is the capacity of its members to make informed judgments about the public good and to promote the general welfare as well as the individual welfare of the particular persons for whom they have special responsibility. If teaching is to become a genuine profession, it must include foundational studies that bring the scholarship of the academic disciplines to bear upon the policies, practices, and public issues facing education, especially those involving such basic values and principles of American constitutional democracy spelled out in CIVITAS and the National Standards for Civics and Government. I treat them very briefly in my Minnesota lecture: the public good, justice, freedom, equality, diversity, truth, and patriotism. (pp. 38-43)

The codification of national education goals in federal law under the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act," could truly be a landmark in the history of American education. And as federal funds are allocated to states and institutions of higher education to help improve pre-service and in-service teacher education, we in the organized profession of education should be doing all we can to see that such funds are not limited, as they now are, by the narrower purposes to equip educators with subject matter and pedagogical expertise.

New standards for teacher education should be defined in such way that the primary civic purpose of American education is appropriately and specifically cared for. If the civic foundations of education are simply ignored or tucked in under the headings of "subject matter" or "pedagogical expertise," the civic purpose will be lost. And if the general "foundations of professional understanding" are recognized but do not specifically center upon the role of schools in a democratic society, the civic purpose will be muted at best.

As I say in my article in the Journal of Teacher Education:

I would not leave the [foundational] task solely to courses in the academic studies of general or liberal education or to case studies in the pedagogical methods or practice teaching periods of training. To understand and carry out the appropriate role of education in a democratic society, all teachers need (1) to know what the fundamental values and principles of a democratic society are, and they must (2) undertake sustained and specific study of those values, principles, and institutions in such way that they can then pursue their educative role in preserving and regenerating those democratic values and principles. The first point cannot wholly be learned in general education nor can the second point simply be left to the subject matter, pedagogical expertise, or practice of a particular school subject. Both goals should be knit together in an integrated teaching and learning process that I am calling the "civic foundations of teacher education."

So, I urge the appropriate professional education associations to put that theme front and center in their emerging consensus-building process. If we do this seriously, we may be able not only to inject the civic foundations requirements into the new statement of accreditation standards developed by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), but we may also be able to influence the movement for national education standards being pursued by federal and state governments, by the major assessment agencies like the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and the New Standards Project, and by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. If we can achieve model national standards for the study of civics and government in the schools K-12, as we have done so successfully, why not do the same for the civic foundations of teacher education? Unless we mobilize our efforts around the civic foundations, I believe that what is now usually called "the social foundations of education" in teacher education will become still further marginalized in the 1990s.

In the past year, my hopes for the civic foundations of education were lifted by President Clinton's support for states to push forward with national academic standards, with federal funding to develop national assessments in math and reading and with his proposal for federal support of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. These moves and his often repeated references to the importance of character and civic education were encouraging. I even had hopes that these moves would make it possible for the key players in teacher education to give more attention to the fundamental civic mission of American education in their efforts to reform American education.

Up to now, the most widely publicized projects of the educational reform movement have scarcely addressed the civic mission. For example, in July 1992 when the New American Schools Development Corporation announced its eleven Select Design team to receive millions of private money to "reinvent the American school" and to design "break the mold schools," I found sparse mention of education for citizenship aside from a few references to voluntary community service of some kind. The dominant themes were learning by doing, hands-on-experience, active and experiential learning, student-initiated projects, parent participation, and so on. Except for frequent references to high technology and "total quality management," I had the eerie feeling that I had just arrived at Teachers College in the 1930s and was listening to William H. Kilpatrick expound on John Dewey and the project method in progressive education.

Similarly, the early efforts of Chris Whittle's Edison project argued that the possibilities for restructuring their new, made-for-profit, private schools would be to "return pleasure to the learning process, abolish current academic subject boundaries, increase parental engagement and make learning fun again." I did not find reference to the civic goal of schooling, although I had strongly recommended just that when I sent a copy of CIVITAS to President Benno Schmidt

before he left the presidency of Yale to undertake his new duties as head of the Edison project. Some time later, I received a letter from one of his staff members thanking me for my interest in the project.

"What REALLY Matters Most"

So, it was with special anticipation that I looked forward to seeing the proposals of the latest and most widely publicized report of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future entitled What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future (September 1996). The Commission chair was Governor James B. Hunt, Jr. of North Carolina and the executive director was Linda-Darling Hammond, William F. Russell Professor in the Foundations of Education at Teachers College. This leadership, plus the notable roster of Commission members consisting of academic, professional, political, and business leaders and support from the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation guaranteed widespread public attention.

The Commission set forth what it called a challenge to the nation and its education leaders, a challenge requiring unprecedented effort but not necessarily new theory: "Common sense suffices: American students are entitled to teachers who know their subjects, understand their students and what they need, and have mastered the professional skills required to make learning come alive." These three elements are repeated throughout the Summary Report and the full 150 page report. Naturally, I looked especially for what it said about the basic mission of universal education and its place in teacher education: education for civitas. I found one sentence in the Summary Report: "The education challenge facing the United States....is that schools must help the vast majority of young people reach levels of skills and competence once thought within reach of only a few, while also supporting a just and civil society that helps maintain our democratic life." (p. 8)

This statement is unexceptional and is one with which I thoroughly agree. The trouble I found was that the report constantly used only mathematics and science as subject matter examples of the ways the challenge could be met; it seldom mentions the other core subjects in the school curriculum; it never mentions civics and government as a core school subject or education for civitas as a core element in the education of teachers, either in the liberal arts background or as the civic foundations in teacher education. Whether this was an attempt to avoid examples from core subjects that might arouse controversy, as the history and English standards had done, or whether it was simply that high standards in math and science are readily acceptable to business and political leaders, I do not know.

I did note that the main body of the Report of the Commission spells out the ways that the education of teachers should be organized around the new standards expected of students. Eight points of a reinvented teacher education program are (pp.76-77):

1. Stronger disciplinary preparation in the field to be taught
 2. Greater focus on learning and development of students
 3. More knowledge about curriculum and assessment design
 4. Greater understanding of how to help special-needs students
 5. Multicultural competence for working with diverse learners
 6. Preparation for collaboration with colleagues and parents
 7. Technological skills for the Information Age; and
 8. Strong emphasis on reflection and inquiry
- I agree thoroughly that all of these elements are important in acceptable programs of teacher education. But I note especially that while there is emphasis upon diversity and "multicultural competence" there is no reference to competence in the civic knowledge, values, and skills of democratic citizenship required of every teacher as well as of every student. I find that what the Report fails to say about education for civitas is "what really matters most." Teacher education programs that stress only "the discipline to be taught; course work in teaching learning, curriculum, and child development; extensive practice teaching; and a master's

degree in education" simply will not do for the sustenance of a constitutional democracy in the 21st century.

On a more positive note, I applaud the Commission's effort to mobilize three major professional organizations to reach agreement on what teachers should know and be able to do in order to help students to achieve high standards: the National Council for Accreditation in Teacher Education (NCATE) to improve schools of education, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) to improve state licensing requirements for beginning teachers, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) to set standards for advanced professional certification.

Praise for the Commission's efforts came from many quarters. President Clinton, Secretary Riley and the U.S. Department of Education, and seven states almost immediately signed on. The New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, and I don't know how many other newspaper editorials bespoke approval, including my local Monterey County Herald. The Phi Delta Kappan's issue of November 1996 featured the Commission Report with seven articles written by the leaders of the major professional organizations that were seeking collaboration in teacher education: Arthur Wise for NCATE, Linda Darling-Hammond for the Report, Gordon Ambach for INTASC, and James Kelly for the NBPTS. Only Kelly coupled "the continual need for a well-educated citizenry to sustain the nation's democratic values and institutions" with the need for better-educated workers to bolster the nation's economic competitiveness.

However, I know from prior experience that Gordon Ambach favored the views of CIVITAS, for he was an active member of its National Review Council. He was also a member of the National Advisory Committee and of the National Review Committee of the National Standards for Civics and Government. He was one of those educators who were instrumental in getting civics and government added to the original "core studies" of America 2000 and Goals 2000, which at the outset were limited to English, math, science, history, and geography. Jim Kelly was a member of the National Review Committee of the National Standards. So, I would hope and expect that these several leaders would approve the kind of requirement in education for civitas that I believe should be imbedded in the accreditation, the licensing, and the certification of the new legions of teachers who will be needed in the very near future.

Among the other authors in that issue of Kappan, the only one who includes an explicit argument for democratic values and citizenship as a major ingredient in teacher education was, as I was ready to expect, John Goodlad. He makes it clear that "what schools should do above all else is development of democratic character: "enculturation of the young into a social and political democracy....The outcomes [of schooling] must constantly and unwaveringly be the development of individual and collective democratic character." Somewhat later in two Commentary pieces in Education Week (February 5 and 12, 1997), Goodlad expressed cautious optimism about the National Commission's recommendations and welcomed its support for strengthened schools of education

I find Goodlad's views on democratic character thoroughly consonant with my own. I hope that his former leadership role as president of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and his present role as co-director of the Center for Educational Renewal at the University of Washington will enable him and like-minded leaders like David Imig, the chief executive officer of AACTE, to nudge the momentum to reform teacher education, now reenergized by the National Commission, to include explicit requirements for education for civitas in the accreditation of schools of education, the state licensing of beginning teachers, and the certification of outstanding professional teachers.

Of course, criticisms of the National Commission came from several other points of view. Chester Finn found it basically to be a reflection of the teacher education establishment,

teachers unions, and schools of education, which he believes are basically inimical to American education; the report consists of a defense of the status quo with "a few token mild shaker uppers." The "Network News and Views" gave the Commission's Report in its October 1996 issue only a short and somewhat huffy notice. Others, as I have done, criticized the Commission for what it did not do. For example, in Education Week (February 19, 1997) Maxine Greene, William F. Russell Professor Emeritus in the Foundations of Education at Teachers College, criticized the Report for "its all-too-familiar dismissal of the arts," which has been one of her major interests throughout her career.

As might be expected, Maxine, who was the second Russell Professor in the Foundations of Education, and I, who was the first, bring to bear our distinctive views of what the "Foundations of Education" should mean in teacher education. They also appear to differ in some notable respects from those of Linda Darling-Hammond, who is the third Russell Professor at Teachers College. As I indicated in my Minnesota Lecture and in this Afterword, I have been trying to convince the foundations scholars in the American Educational Studies Association (AESA) and in the Council of Learned Societies in Education (CLSE) to hammer away at the certification and licensing agencies to make the civic foundations of education a required core in teacher education as well as in grades K-12 and in the liberal arts. In the past couple of years I have tried to persuade three university schools of education to do that very thing: Wisconsin, Indiana, and most recently Minnesota.

I warrant that the rhetoric of my Minnesota CIVITAS lecture and this Afterword will sound out of sync with that of many of the younger generation of foundations professors, but I sincerely hope that an effort will be made to find common ground among foundations scholars rather than emphasizing what is surely a generation gap. My emphasis on education for civitas includes a balance among the democratic values of the public good, individual rights, justice, equality, diversity, truth, and patriotism. These values evoke different responses from a younger generation devoted increasingly to diversity, pluralism, and multiculturalism, but I believe, as CIVITAS and the National Standards for Civics and Government do, that all seven civic values should be treated in good faith as bulwarks of democracy. Such ideas and values must be strengthened if public education itself is to survive and thrive.

I believe that the members of AESA and of CLSE should be "empowering" the public and the profession to withstand what Frank Rich in The New York Times (October 9, 1996) termed the "escalating passions of a bitter culture war that threatens to boil over after Nov. 5." Foundations scholars need to try to damp down and counteract the fiery attacks from Bork and Bennett, Robertson and Reed, the Christian Coalition, the Promise Keepers, First Things, etc., etc. they should try to extinguish the fires of incendiary efforts that would consume public education with the politics of mistrust and proposals for vouchers, parental rights, prayer, and privatization. They should vigorously try to inject the scholarly objectives of education for civitas into the accreditation standards set up by NCATE, of which CLSE is a constituent part.

Meanwhile, I am cautiously optimistic that the Commission's *What Matters Most* will move forward a consensus on national standards for what teachers should know and be able to do in the civic foundations of education. The complete Report does indeed devote three of its 150 pages to the urgent need "to reaffirm a consensus about the role and purposes of public education in a democracy —and the prime importance of learning in meeting those purposes." Those pages (10-13) are eloquently "foundational," but I found no clue in the curriculum content or methods proposed in the report as to the ways that pre-service or in-service teachers will be prepared to join in or to lead this consensus-building process on behalf of public education and the democratic values it is designed to serve.

There is much talk with which I agree about the need "to develop and enforce rigorous standards for teacher preparation, initial licensing, and continuing development." There is

praise for the standards being set by NCATE, INTASC, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, but the overall ingredients of a reinvented teacher education program seem to be summed up in the phrase that "the best teachers understand their subjects, know how young people learn, and have mastered a range of teaching methods." I don't find a distinctive foundational theme in those three familiar ingredients, no matter how reinvented or reinvigorated they may become. And I don't find specific attention to civic curriculum content in the teacher education program required of new or inservice teachers.

Perhaps the greatest contribution of the Commission Report will be that it caught the attention of public and profession alike, from President Clinton to local school districts. Especially valuable is the fact that several of the most important professional education organizations have been prompted to work together, along with key federal and foundational support. This is symbolized in the Education Week story (March 12, 1997) by Ann Bradley with the headline "Clinton Teacher Board Proposal Marks Milestone." She also points out that the "presidential stamp of approval is the result of cooperation among three present and former state governors, James B. Hunt of North Carolina, Richard Riley of South Carolina, and Bill Clinton of Arkansas." (Democrats all.)

That all would not be sweetness and light in the reaction of the states to the Commission was similarly illustrated in two articles in Education Week (April 9, 1997). One described a round-table conference at the White House in which Clinton was making "his pitch for new national tests" to measure achievement toward new national education standards. He received enthusiastic support from Delaine Eastin, California's State Superintendent of Public Instruction (a Democrat) and executives of 200 California technology companies. But sharp criticism came immediately from California's Office of Child Development which is controlled by Governor Pete Wilson (a Republican),

The problem, however, is not easily defined as a purely partisan "politics of standards." In the same issue of Education Week, two officials of the Council for Basic Education, a conservative organization favoring high academic standards, praised Clinton's campaign of "Stumping for Standards." They were pleased because the tests would not come from the Federal government but would be based on the NAEP, "a highly regarded exam that has been created through consensus by teachers and subject specialists and used by states for 27 years." Such tests would make possible comparisons of school achievement among the states. They agreed, however, with David Broder of the Washington Post that the President is not going far enough, that testing should eventually include many more subjects than just reading and math, and that it should continue beyond the proposed one year of testing in 1999. But, the politics of standards appears when the authors, Christopher Cross and Scott Joftus, argue that it would be politically unwise to include other subjects for testing at this time, because "there is simply not enough consensus over what all students should learn in such subjects as science and history, and such a debate would detract from the wide consensus that exists in reading and math."

Here, again, I believe that education for civitas could come to the rescue. The National Standards for Civics and Government have already been adopted by NAEP for its testing program in 1998. The civics standards have already arrived at the "consensus" that Cross and Joftus are worried about. To be sure, there will be controversy over them in the political climate in which we now live. But, I believe that the civics standards should not be avoided or skipped over because they might be controversial. What subject is more appropriate for teaching the civic understanding and the civility to be expected of democratic citizens? We should not wait until grown-ups become members of Congress before they try to solve problems with civility, as 200 members of the House of Representatives tried to do at Hershey, Pennsylvania in March 1997. We should begin in the elementary and secondary schools and carry on right through undergraduate college years and professional education. "Hands-on learning" has long been a

by-word of educational reformers. The Standards for Civics and Government will enable us to talk more and teach more about "minds-on" learning as well.

In my Minnesota lecture and in this Afterword I concentrated mostly on education for civitas in schools and in professional education. Elsewhere, I have dealt with civitas in undergraduate college education, most recently in a paper on "CIVITAS@UWMadison" delivered at a joint conference of the University of Wisconsin Integrated Liberal Studies Program and the Meiklejohn Education Association. I will not try to revisit my own previous writings, but simply make the point that the central core of liberal and general education for all students after high school must include education for civitas as a significant requirement of all students.

One recent headline in the New York Times (March 5, 1997) reads: "A Plan Seeks to Inspire Civics and Big Questions." A committee of faculty members and students at UCLA have proposed to "replace traditional freshman classes like English Comp and Sociology 101 with a core interdisciplinary curriculum that encourages students 'to ask the large questions and become good citizens.'" Among the three proposed required courses would be one on "Democracy." This sounds like education for civitas and like Alexander Astin's views that I quoted in my Minnesota lecture (p. 45). The importance of the UCLA program even fits nicely with an article by George Will in the Washington Post (March 30, 1997) in which he praised a new book by Anne Mathews entitled Bright College Years: Inside the American Campus Today. One statistic: One of the courses with the highest enrollments across the country is American Studies. Such courses could be logical candidates to rally around education for civitas as proposed at UCLA.

An International "Framework for Education for Democracy"

I concluded my Minnesota lecture by referring to the international significance of education for civitas. I am glad to report that since May of 1996 a dramatic new development has taken place that parallels very closely what I have been urging for the United States. It is a project called CIVITAS: An International Civic Education Exchange Program, which grew out of the Prague Civitas conference mentioned briefly in my Minnesota lecture. The Center for Civic Education is coordinating a two-year cooperative international project to develop a "Framework for Education for Democracy." The Framework will outline the educational components required for citizens to understand the basic concepts of politics and political life and the core requirements of a constitutional democratic political order. By seeking the full cooperation of interested educators and governments around the world, the project will attempt to develop a consensus among broadly diverse participants about what the core concepts of constitutional democracy are and what they mean.

The intent of the project is that the Framework will become a resource for the development of civic education programs to prepare youth and adults for democratic citizenship in countries around the world, especially those that are emerging from some forms of authoritarianism. The Framework will be designed to be applicable to and adaptable by any country that has established or seeks to establish, consolidate, or maintain a constitutional democratic political system. The framework could easily be called "Education for Democratic Civitas."

The "Framework of Education for Democracy" is funded by the U.S. Department of Education and conducted with the assistance of the U.S. Information Agency. Although the project is supported by these branches of the U.S. Government, the developmental process and the Framework will be solely the responsibility of the Center for Civic Education and the international committees established for the project by the Center. Public and private groups alike, such as ministries of education, universities, teacher training institutions, independent educational centers, academic and professional associations, and textbook publishers as well as teachers and educational administrators from many countries will take part in drawing up the Framework. The goal is that it thus will be adaptable to the particular circumstances of

different national states. As a private, independent, nonprofit educational organization, the Center for Civic Education has already demonstrated its ability to achieve these purposes in its twenty years of success in publishing curriculum materials widely used in the United States and around the world. Among these, CIVITAS: A Framework for Civic Education (1991) and the National Standards for Civics and Government (1994), were both originally focused on the United States. They now provide a basis for constructing world class standards in the teaching of civics and government.

The Center is in the process of organizing a number of international committees to undertake the project, aiming for completion by the fall of 1998. The Framework Steering Committee, consisting of several academic scholars from several countries, was organized in the spring of 1997, and an early draft of the Framework was being circulated for preliminary discussion.

This international development to promote education for civitas in many countries of the world is of profound significance for the peace and progress of the world. It strengthens the efforts to raise the academic standards of students in the United States and in the newly independent states. In both cases, the education of teachers is a crucial link in the process.

Meanwhile, in Washington on April 17-18 a national forum was held entitled "Attracting and Preparing Teachers for the 21st Century." The forum included 50 of the 1997 Teachers of the Year and 50 university and teacher education leaders (by invitation only) for a candid discussion of the best ways to prepare teachers for the United States in coming years. I shall be interested to see if this American project devotes as much attention to education for civitas in the preparation of American teachers as does the international Framework.

And toward the end of April 1997 a whole galaxy of events and conferences highlighted various facets of the movement for educational reform that could have enormous bearing on strengthening education for civitas. However, this swirl of attention could also serve to undercut the movement by appeals that divert attention from embedding the three-fold aspects of education for democratic civitas in teacher education: civic knowledge, civic values and principles, and civic participation.

Civil Society and Service Learning

For example, April 13-17 was featured around the country as "National Volunteer Week." It extolled the importance and rewards for students and adults who volunteered on behalf of some of the many non-governmental agencies like the Red Cross, Salvation Army, "Meals on Wheels" for the elderly, neighborhood watches, help for the homeless, environmental projects, PTA, teachers' aides, and on and on. Undoubtedly this participation was valuable for those who took part in this one week. But how much did it contribute explicitly to the fundamental civic knowledge, civic commitments, and civic values that are the long range goals of a well-rounded education for civitas?

Simultaneously, in the effort to apply the values of volunteering to school practice on a more organized basis, a group of some 40 educational and social service agencies announced on April 14 the forming of a coalition called the "Partnering Initiative on Education and Civil Society." The goal of a ten-year program is to make service learning and "civil education" an integral part of linking schools to other community services. The potential is indicated by the fact that many of the leading professional education organizations have signed on to the idea of service learning, including: the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National School Boards Association, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the American Association of School Administrators, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, several other higher education organizations, and the

U.S. Department of Education. The group was convened by the Corporation for National Service, which administers AmeriCorps and other federal programs of service learning.

According to Education Week (April 16, 1997), the initiative will stress seven principles of "civil education:"

- making service learning an integral part of academic programs
 - promoting character education
 - teaching the historical legacy of civil society
 - allowing students more input in designing their learning experiences
 - forging more partnerships between schools and business, community organizations, and colleges
 - giving parents and students more say in policies affecting their schools
 - finding the resources to accomplish these goals.

Peter Applebome in the New York Times (April 14, 1997) pointed out that the motivation of the organizers of the initiative stressed the need for schools to recapture a sense of community, prepare students for good citizenship, and reinvigorate American democracy at a time when too much attention is being paid to preparing students for jobs or simply pushing for higher test scores. He also noted that conservative critics like Phyllis Schlafly, president of the Eagle Forum, opposed the idea because its so-called character education might interfere with parental upbringing of their children and take away from the central focus of schooling on the basics of academic learning. It's too early to determine whether this campaign for "partnering for civil education" will do more or less to achieve education for civitas as I have been defining it than will the "National Forum on Attracting and Preparing Teachers for the 21st Century." The stress on "civil education" rather than "civic education" may mean that it is inclined to stress the non-governmental and voluntary aspects of society and education rather than the role of government and public institutions of education.

Two examples illustrating possible confusion over what schools should be doing on behalf of education for civitas took place almost simultaneously over the last weekend of April 1997. From April 26 to 28 in Washington, D.C., 1200 high school students were taking part in the finals of a national competition called "We the People..." to see which teams from schools from all over the country displayed most convincingly their understanding of the U.S. Constitution. These students had been studying the Constitution during the school year and were the winners of competitions in the form of simulated legislative hearings held among schools in nearly all Congressional districts and states. These were the state champions. The knowledge, the thought, and the skill on display were exemplary examples of relating academic learning to active participation, conducted each year by the Center for Civic Education.

A Civitas "Summa" for the Next Education Summit

The dominant public news of that weekend was, of course, the "Presidents' Summit for America's Future" convened in Philadelphia from April 27-29, headlining President Clinton, former Presidents Ford, Carter, and Bush, chaired by General Colin Powell, and including 30 governors, 100 mayors, and delegations from all 50 states and 140 communities. This Summit, inspired and coordinated by the Points of Light Foundation kicked off a campaign for greater volunteerism on the part of all the associations of civil society as well as business corporations and government. The goal over the next three years is to improve the conditions of two million at-risk children and youth in five ways: provide caring mentors as models for the children to emulate and to aid in their learning; access to better health care for needy youth; safe and constructive out-of-school programs; useful job training; and engendering among the youth themselves the ideals of service to others.

General Powell is leading the new organization for volunteerism called the Alliance for Youth. It's too early to judge how much further momentum the educators' "Partnering Initiative

on Education for Civil Society" will gain from the Presidents' summit or whether they will be in competition. But it is surely clear that the Philadelphia occasion gained far more attention from the media and the public than did the students' display of knowledge and expertise about the Constitution in Washington. Whatever else, the Summit surely drew attention to the meaning of civitas: the role of government in the United States and the role of citizens in American society. At the outset, President Clinton said "I'm here because I want to redefine the meaning of citizenship in America." And the New York Times on April 29 summed up the Summit in the headline "Presidents Call for Big Citizenship, Not Big Government."

This multiplying of attention to the voluntary aspects of the role of citizenship in American life can only be beneficial if it supports and encourages and does not detract from the need for continuing, systematic, and professional education for civitas in schools, colleges, and teacher education. If they support each other, they could produce a bountiful opportunity to combat the "politics of mistrust." And I hope that they will energize the spread of an education for civitas whose goal the Times could call "Better Citizenship and Better Government."

But there are indeed ominous signs for public education and the role of government in civic education. In coming years, we must thread our way through the minefields being set for public education and for teacher education by extremists on the right as well as extremists on the left. The religious right is mounting national campaigns to elect conservative majorities on local school boards as well as in state legislatures and in Congress. These are largely devoted to reducing the role of government in education or at least increasing the role of religion in education. Campaigns to authorize public funds to provide vouchers for all parents to send their children to private and sectarian religious schools are being mounted in many states. The Supreme Court is reconsidering the constitutional precedents that it set in 1985 with the *Aguilar v. Fenton* decision, which prohibited public school teachers from going into parochial schools to give remedial lessons to low-achieving, poor children who qualified for federal funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This reconsideration, supported by the Clinton administration, may well provide an occasion for an increasingly conservative Court to make still more permeable Jefferson's and Madison's wall of separation between church and state. We will know by June 1997 how firm is the wall's foundation.

Since the agendas of some conservative organizations signalize clear and present dangers to the future of public education, I do not believe that public education will be saved by the rhetoric of programs in teacher education whose primary goal is touted to the public by professors of education who rely primarily on the development of a "critical pedagogy" that "empowers teachers" to become "transformative intellectuals who are capable of wondering, pondering, and critique."

Teacher education must not shrink from the historic educational goal called "civic virtue," defined as a citizen's obligation to promote the public good in a democratic republic. The idea of civic virtue as a prime value of public education was virtually laughed out of the classrooms and campuses during the student generations of the 1960s and 1970s, and thus is seldom heard in the teacher education programs of the 1980s. Perhaps, the revival of the volunteering mood to service learning will provide a more hospitable climate for professional educators to deal with the values of civic virtue in education. Indeed, the growth of the politics of mistrust of government has become so prevalent that the reenergizing of a sense of civic virtue in teacher education may be its most important agendum in the 1990s. We need more than ever not only a good public education but we need a public-good education. We will not achieve either one, unless we create a public-good teacher education.

On this note, I close this Afterword in the hope that the new enterprises of education for democratic civitas on both the domestic and international fronts can succeed in their own terms and in support of one another. For, above all, the success of democracy in any country in the

world rests in the long run upon the success of education for democratic civitas in its schools, in its higher educational institutions, and in its education of teachers.

What permanent and prestigious American educational agency, non-governmental and non-partisan, could provide a powerful leadership for teacher education programs in such way that civic knowledge, civic values, constitutional principles, and civic participation are all nicely balanced in order to promote a healthier democratic government and citizenry as well as a vibrant civil society? For one, I nominate the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which did so much under the leadership of Ernest Boyer to promote education for civitas from the early childhood years to the college and university years. This challenge to make civitas a core element in teacher education is especially suited to Boyer's successor as president of the Carnegie Foundation, Lee S. Shulman, who is Charles E. Ducommun Professor of Education at Stanford University.

I hope that Lee Shulman and other educational leaders will be able to synthesize the current educational reform efforts and focus them upon achieving (1) higher academic standards in the civic knowledge, the civic values and the civic participation for all students at all levels of education, (2) the accrediting, licensing, and certification of all teachers in the civic foundations of teacher education, and (3) the dispositions of civic virtue and the skills of civic participation that can best be achieved by service learning for all. If these three ingredients of education for civitas could motivate and inform one other, together and in concert, they could teach the civic lessons that all Americans must learn. The first priority of the next Educational Summit should be to bring together representatives of federal, state, and local government, the voluntary civil society, and the educational professions to begin the joint process of considering a Summa of Education for Citizenship (*Summa Educationis pro Civitati*) that will guide American education into the 21st century.

I know that many educators and politicians argue that educational reform must work from the "bottom up" rather than being imposed from the "top down." But how is general agreement and consensus to be achieved unless a wide variety of people try to talk seriously and work together to formulate the "summa" of a subject? My Latin dictionary defines the word *summa* as "the main thing, chief point, principal matter, sum, essence, substance." The Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd edition, Unabridged defines the English word *summa* as "a comprehensive work or series of works covering, synthesizing, or summarizing a particular field or subject." In Latin, or in English, or in any other language, "the main thing" needed in the world today is the security and flourishing of democratic republican governments in all parts of the world. And that is why it is so important for educators, government, and civil society to concentrate attention upon "the substance, the chief point, the principal matter" of the best type of education to serve democratic civitas.